





Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924086857350>

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 086 857 350

In compliance with current
copyright law, Cornell University
Library produced this
replacement volume on paper
that meets the ANSI Standard
Z39.48-1992 to replace the
irreparably deteriorated original.

2001

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



FROM
William Sulzer

OF TIME AND SPACE.

By WM. SULZER

Former Governor of New York.

Our word time comes from the old Saxon word *tima*. It is not related to the Latin word *tempus*.

Time is a measurement from one event to another event. It is the distance of duration from one period to another period.

What we call time is measured by successive intervals. The astronomical information for this statement is the rotation of the earth, which, from remotest antiquity, has been employed as a measurement. Astronomers use what they call sidereal time, and regulate their chronometers accordingly. Many ancient people measured time by the moon—called lunar time. Now the countries of the world use solar time, which means the successive returns of the sun to the meridian; but neither lunar time, nor solar time, was ever an accurate measurement. The Mayan people fixed their time by the transit of Venus, which was the most accurate calendar of any people in the history of the world.

More than 7,000 years ago the wise men of India saw four planets in conjunction. So far as they knew this had never happened before. It was a marvelous sight. They called it the "Caliyoga." Then they decreed that it should constitute the year one, and that every 600 years thereafter a Hindu god, or sacred person, should be born. This reckoning was subsequently adopted by other people in the East, but most of them changed the number of years to suit their own views, history, or tribal traditions. Astronomers now know that these four planets are in conjunction every 28,000 years.

When the Roman Senate decreed Augustus Caesar god, and made his person sacred, they adopted a new calendar, and made his birthday the year one—Anno Domini. They also named our days and months. Their calendar, however,

was so inaccurate that centuries afterwards it had to be reformed by adding ten days. This change made it more accurate, but it is now far from being correct.

The story of time, throughout the earth, is one of constant change and variation. As a matter of fact there is no such thing as "Time". It is a mere figment of the imagination, and has nothing to do with the stellar universe. Nevertheless, I hope the day is not far distant when the greatest scientists in the world will meet, and agree upon a more accurate system of measurement than we have at present. Our days, and months, and years, should be so arranged that our calendar will be accurate, and excite less derision, and cause less confusion. Our calendar now is archaic, and out of line with scientific knowledge.

Regarding space, that is a different proposition. Space is a fact. We can see it. We know it. It has no center, and no circumference. It had no beginning, and can have no end. It is occupied by all the matter in the stellar universe, of which our earth, and our sun, are infinitesimal grains of sand on the shoreless sea of interstellar space. So I assert, from study, observation, and reflection, without fear of successful contradiction, the following, viz:

FIRST: There is no time.

SECOND: Space has no limitations. It is not expanding or contracting.

THIRD: Matter is scattered here and there, throughout space. Matter is alive, and in continuous flux, which means change and transformation. If all the matter we know about in space was united it would mean, so far as space is concerned, just about as much as an atom in the rotunda of the Pennsylvania Railroad Station. It is hard to visualize this, but it is true. Matter is indestructible. The natural state of matter is *motion*. Everything moves; everything changes. There is nothing permanent but change—metamorphism. For every action there is reaction, of equal force, and opposite in direction.

FOURTH: Motion is a natural law like change. All matter is in constant motion. There is nothing static, and the law of motion is perpetual. Motion is force; and force is energy; and energy in its last analysis is electricity. The law of motion applies to every electron in space.

FIFTH: These natural laws which apply to space, matter, change, and motion are immutable. The knowledge of these natural laws, and their application, constitutes all that we know concerning the stellar universe.

Now and then a few Physicists advance the theory that time and space are one—three parts space and one part time. This, they tell us, is the recipe for the cosmos. However, a little thought will prove to any logical brain that this theory is erroneous. As there is no time, and time does not exist, it follows as a logical conclusion that time cannot be a part of space.

We also hear much in recent days about "Relativity"—especially from Professor Einstein. Relativity is as old as the mountains. It was taught, thousands of years ago, by the wise men of India; then by the sages of Chaldea; and from their teachings the Greeks learned about it. Some of the greatest of the ancient Greeks declared that everything in the stellar universe was relative. Before Professor Einstein was born several German philosophers, and English scientists, asserted the theory.

I have read everything Mr. Einstein has written, and so far as I can find out he has made no discovery, nor added an iota to the sum of human knowledge. There is no doubt about his ability as a mathematician, but there has been nothing added to mathematics since Newton.

Hegel boasted that only one person in the world understood him. Einstein boasts that only about a dozen people in the world understand him. Hegel was in error, and Einstein is laboring under a delusion. Einstein's abracadabra, like that of many of his predecessors, in the classic word of Henry Ford is "Bunk."

they said, his campaign statement of election expenses was irregular, notwithstanding that it was shown to be in accordance with the law.

The laws of New York declare the Governor can only be removed "for wilful and corrupt misconduct in office." The conspirators in the "Murphy Court of Infamy" removed the Governor on a flimsy charge of something he is alleged to have omitted to do long prior to his inauguration—and even this charge was shown to be absolutely false.

Mr. Sulzer is the first man in history to be removed from a great elective office by a "Packed Star Chamber Political Court" for an alleged something omitted before he took office. The so-called Quack trial was a travesty on Justice.

The truth of the matter is that the Governor refused to be bossed; worked for the people instead of Invisible Government; could not be bought or bullied; and had set in motion the machinery of justice to send political grafters to prison. As one of the bosses put it after the trial: "**We had to put him out, or he would put us in**"—meaning that if the bosses did not remove the Governor, the Governor would send them to prison for robbing the taxpayers.

Mr. Sulzer is an American—through and through—and his record proves it. He has always been a quarter of a century ahead of the times. He is popular with all sorts and conditions of people because of his inherent honesty, his generosity, and his sunshiny disposition. No wonder he is so successful as a vote-getter, and that his loyal followers call him "Plain Bill"—and love him for the enemies he has made.

Governor Sulzer is a "Commoner." The more you know him, the more you see of him, the more you study him at close range—the

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 1757
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

Sayings of a Sourdough

William Sulzer

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 1757
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

Sayings of a Sourdough

William Sulzer

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1938,
By Wm. Sulzer



Printed in the United States of America

Sayings of a Sourdough

By "SOURDOUGH BILL"

THE FOLLOWING WILL TELL YOU

(Reprinted by permission from the Alaska Miner, Nov. 15, 1929.)

"Last night the 'Sourdoughs of Alaska' gave a great reception to their friend, and Life Member, Wm. Sulzer, of New York—lawyer and orator; soldier and statesman; thinker and traveler; pioneer and philosopher—one of the great men of our times.

"Mr. Sulzer delivered a great speech on the 'Wonderland of the World'; but as no stenographer took it down we cannot report it, and we regret it; but we know Sulzer, and we want our readers to know him as well as we do—so here is the Truth—and that will prevail.

"'Sourdough Bill'—Wm. Sulzer—was born in Elizabeth, New Jersey, on March 18, 1863, of German and Scotch Irish parentage. His father was a farmer near Elizabeth, and William was educated in the country school, and later for law at Columbia University.

"His parents intended their son for the ministry; but he preferred the law, and was duly admitted to the bar on attaining his majority,

(4)

in 1884. He soon became recognized as a sound lawyer, and an eloquent public speaker. His success in law has only been equaled by his prominence in politics. He was elected to the New York Assembly in 1889, and re-elected for five years. In 1893 he was the Speaker of the Legislature—the youngest in the State. He made a splendid record for usefulness at Albany. No one ever questioned his honesty, his sincerity, or his capability.

"In 1894 the old Tenth District, of New York City, sent him to the Fifty-fourth Congress. He was returned for twenty years, by increasing majorities. His course in Congress was one of hard work and steady independence. He was a staunch friend of the suffering Cubans. His sympathies are world-wide; his ideas are broad; and his work national and international.

"He introduced the law declaring war against Spain; the constitutional amendment by which United States Senators are elected by direct votes of the people; and the law increasing the pay of letter carriers. He is the author of the resolution denouncing the Jewish outrages in Russia; the law abrogating Russian Treaties—which historians now declare precipitated the World War; the law increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Union; the law to raise the wreck of the Maine; and the copyright law. He is the author of the law to re-establish the merchant marine; for a general parcels post; for na-

tional aid in the construction of good roads; the law to create the Department of Labor, with a Secretary having a seat in the Cabinet; and of many other measures all in the interest of the people of the country. His record at Albany, and at Washington, is a constructive monument to his untiring zeal, his indefatigable industry; and his far seeing statesmanship.

"Mr. Sulzer was chairman of the important Committee on Foreign Affairs, and made good as a diplomat by keeping the country out of war with Mexico; by re-organizing the Diplomatic and Consular Service, placing the latter on the merit system; and aiding in the establishment of the Republic of China. He has always been a great friend and advocate of the Chinese People. He is widely read; is considered a fine international lawyer; and has demonstrated great ability along legislative, executive, and diplomatic lines.

"On account of the great record Mr. Sulzer had made in Congress, and in the Legislature, the people of New York, in 1912, demanded his nomination for Governor, and he was elected by the largest majority ever given a candidate for that office. As the Governor he did more big honest, fearless, progressive, and independent things in less time than any other man that ever held that office. Because he did these things, and because he was independent, the corrupt Bosses, and the Predatory interests, conspired to get him out of

(6)

his position, and his ouster—was the greatest political conspiracy in the history of America. According to Theodore Roosevelt, Albert Shaw, editor of the Review of Reviews, Chief Justice Edward White, of the U.S. Supreme Court, Colonel Henry Watterson, Chief Justice Edgar M. Cullen, of the Court of Appeals, Senator John C. Spooner, Colonel Alexander S. Bacon, and thousands of other eminent citizens, Wm. Sulzer had done no wrong, and was the greatest reform Governor in the history of New York. Their judgment, at the time, will be the verdict of history.

"In Alaska Mr. Sulzer is known in every home, and is affectionately called "Sourdough Bill." No man has done more for the great Northland than Wm. Sulzer. No man knows more about Alaska. No man can better present Alaska's greatness. He first came to Alaska in 1883, and since then he has visited and explored Alaska thirty-six times. He is a life member of the Alaska Pioneers; the Sourdoughs; the Arctic Brotherhood, the Walrus Society; the Yukon Club; the Tanana Club; and the Klondyke Stampeders. No man has seen so much of Alaska. No man is more interested in Alaska than Wm. Sulzer and some day Alaska will rear a great monument to his memory for all that he has done for Alaska—and no man ever did more. While in Congress, enacting laws for Alaska, he was called the Wm. Pitt of the Great Northland, and he richly deserves the title. He

(7)

was a prominent figure in every stampede, and an heroic friend in every Gold Camp.

"Sourdough Bill" Sulzer has been mining in Alaska for more than forty years, and has put on the map some of the richest mines in the Northland. He loves mining. He is a miner who mines, and he knows mining from the grass roots to the depths. Like the late George Hearst when he smells a mine he never quits, and he owns today some of the richest mines under the American Flag, and every miner and prospector in Alaska loves 'Bill' and will tell you the word of Sulzer is a guaranteed bond. Go into the mining camps of our far flung frontier, and in almost every shack you will see the picture of Sulzer—the friend of the Pioneer.

"Mr. Sulzer is an American—through and through—and his record proves it. He has always been a quarter of a century ahead of the times. He is popular with all sorts and conditions of people because of his inherent honesty, his generosity, and his sunshiny disposition. No wonder he was so successful as a vote-getter, and that his loyal followers call him 'Plain Bill,' and love him for the enemies he has made.

"Wm. Sulzer is a 'Commoner.' The more you know him, the more you see of him, the more you study him at close range—the more you like him, and the more you appreciate what he has done, and glory in his trials and triumphs. He needs no eulogy, and no de-

fense. His record is as clean as a hound's tooth. His career of struggle for higher and better things, from a poor farm boy to the Governorship of the greatest State in the Union, is an epic poem. He will live in History.

"Mr. Sulzer is of large stature, standing over six feet in height, with a weight of 185 pounds, which he carries with the grace of a trained athlete. He is abstemious; has sandy hair, and steel blue eyes that look straight into yours, and read your innermost thoughts. During the War with Spain, and the World War, he organized a regiment of volunteers, and was elected Colonel, but for political reasons the Sulzer Regiments were not called into active service.

"Mr. Sulzer's record is a monument of human endeavor in the vineyard of the people. He is the author of more good laws for mankind than any man today in America. He has run sixteen times for high public office, and was never defeated but once before the people. He is absolutely honest; fearless; true blue; a genuine statesman; a man who does things; and the most eloquent champion of a righteous cause in our land.

"Mr. Sulzer is a plodder who makes progress; a thinker who acts; an orator who talks facts; a leader who leads; a legislator who legislates; and a statesman who knows the difference between right and wrong; has the courage of his convictions; and dares to do

(9)

the right regardless of personal consequences. His rugged honesty; his loyalty to his friends; his fearless devotion to every duty have made his name a household word among the people of America; and as an Apostle of Liberty forever enshrined him in the hearts of humanity."

Speech of Hon. Wm. Sulzer

at a dinner of the "Alaska Sourdoughs," in the McAlpin Hotel, New York City, January 7, 1925.

(Stenographically reported.)

Mr. Sulzer said:

"My friends, Alaska is a marvelous country. It is a great land. It would make 470 States the size of Rhode Island. It has the greatest gold, and iron, and copper, and lead, and coal, and oil, and tin deposits in North America. Alaska has 599,446 square miles of territory—more than 383,645,440 acres of land—and the greatest fishing waters in all the world, teeming with the best foodfish on earth.

"Alaska is over twice the size of France and Germany; fourteen times the size of the State of New York, and has more copper known today than Michigan and Arizona combined. It is one-fifth the size of the entire United States; has paid for itself one hundred fold over in money actually collected in Alaska and deposited in the federal treasury. Alaska was purchased from Russia for \$7,200,000, less than two cents an acre, and has produced in gold and silver and copper alone more than four hundred times what it cost—the cheap-

est bargain in land in the annals of time.

"Alaska has a known oil and coal-bearing area larger than all the rest of the oil and coal-bearing area of the United States. Alaska has the greatest cattle and sheep ranges in the North, and agricultural possibilities beyond the imagination of the finite mind—a mighty empire is Alaska—the land of opportunity—that welcomes heroic men.

"Take the map of Alaska. If you place this map of Alaska in actual area on the map of the United States, one part of Alaska will be in the Atlantic Ocean opposite Charleston; another part of Alaska will be in the Pacific Ocean opposite San Francisco; another part of Alaska will be in the Gulf of Mexico South of New Orleans; and another part of Alaska will be in Canada, North of the Great Lakes. People have no conception of the vastness of Alaska, and there has been disseminated throughout this country for several years more misinformation regarding Alaska, and its resources, and its people, than about any other matter of public moment in the history of our country.

"Let us examine this map of Alaska. Here is the part of it called Southeastern Alaska; and this part of it is called Northern Alaska. These divisions mark the natural boundaries of Alaska. Nature made them so. Congress cannot change them. In a straight line from Cape Chacon, in Southeastern Alaska, to Point Barrow, in Northwestern Alaska, is about 3,000 miles. In a straight line from Cuba to

Greenland is less than 3,000 miles, and there is nearly as much difference in the climatic conditions in Alaska on the Pacific Coast as there is between Cuba and Greenland on the Atlantic Coast. The climate on our Atlantic Coast is governed to some extent by the Gulf Stream. The climate on the Alaska Coast is governed almost entirely by the wonderful Japan current, and that inexplicable current is much greater than the Gulf Stream.

"Southeastern Alaska has a mild climate. The summers are cool. The winters are warm. The mean temperature at Sitka is the same as the mean temperature at Washington, D.C. Southwestern Alaska has a climate similar to the climate of Southern Canada. North of the Yukon river to the Arctic Ocean Alaska has a cold climate in winter, and a hot climate during the summer months.

"Southeastern Alaska is composed largely of beautiful islands. It is a mineral and a fishing country, rich now, and destined to become more so. Some of these islands in Southeastern Alaska are heavily timbered with valuable pine, spruce, hemlock, and red and yellow cedar—spruce enough for pulp and paper to supply the demand of the United States for a thousand years.

"The timber resources of these islands in Southeastern Alaska are invaluable, and thus far they have never known the sound of the woodman's ax. They are virgin forests. How many people in our country know these matters?

"The fishing industries in Southeastern Alaska are becoming the greatest in the world. According to government reports, there are over thirty different kinds of food fishes, and only recently the United States Fish Commission found the habitat of these fish on the great banks off the coast of Alaska—the home of the cod, and the salmon, and the halibut, and the herring, and the mackerel. This part of Alaska will furnish for years and years to come enough food fish to supply the wants of the people of the United States.

"Southeastern Alaska will never be an agricultural country, because it is too mountainous. It has no valleys and no rivers, but it has an ideal climate, and it is going to be the sportsman's, and the poor man's, and the sick man's paradise. It is a saying up there that 'When the tide is out the table is set,' because no man need go hungry in Southeastern Alaska. He can live without work, on the products of the sea.

"Southwestern Alaska, from the international boundary line to the Aleutian Islands, is a wonderful country and quite different from Southeastern Alaska. This part of Alaska is rich in mineral wealth; incomparable in its possibilities for cattle and agriculture, and part of it is well timbered and exceedingly fertile. There are great valleys in this part of Alaska—the Copper river valley, the Susitna valley, the Yetna valley, the Tanana valley, the valley of the Kuskokwim, and the

White River valley—all awaiting development. It is estimated that in this section of Alaska there is more coal than there is in all the rest of the United States, and within its confines are the greatest cattle and sheep ranges under the American flag. Here is the land for the immigrant. Here is the place for the homeseeker. In these valleys are vast stretches of arable lands, much greater in area than in some of the States of the Union; and this part of Alaska, it is said, by those who are competent to testify, can support a larger number of people than the population of Norway and Sweden and Finland and Denmark combined.

"Look again at the map. On the hills here in Southwestern Alaska are great cattle ranges, and here in abundance grows what is called buffalo grass—grass which stands five or six feet high, rich in saccharine matter; and cattle can graze here all the year without protection from the weather. It is far superior for cattle grazing than the most favored sections of the Northern States. They have no blizzards and the winters, although cold, have little snow, and the climate is dry and invigorating. Cattle graze here all the year and they are fatter and in better condition in the spring than they are in the fall. What a country for the cattleman!

"Southwestern Alaska is destined in the next twenty-five years to have a permanent agricultural and cattle raising population, and the day will come when this part of

Alaska will contain and sustain several millions of people. It has now a permanent population of thousands who have gone there and been there for many years, many of whom were born there, and they intend to stay there. Mark what I say, the day will come when Southeastern and Southwestern Alaska will have a larger population than Norway and Sweden.

"Alaska north of the Yukon river is a vast country, stretching away from the Yukon river to the Arctic Ocean. This part of Alaska has very little timber. It is rich in gold, oil, coal, and other mineral resources and is essentially a mining country. It has vast deposits of gold and tin and oil and coal and various other kinds of minerals. This part of Alaska will always be sparsely inhabited by a migratory people who go there to mine, and when the mines are worked out they will come away.

"Alaska's production of mineral wealth is growing apace. The mineral production for 1925 is estimated at \$38,370,000, of which \$27,150,000 comes from copper and gold. The gold production of 1924 amounted to \$19,123,749. The copper output is estimated at 132,900,000 pounds for 1925, against 4,241,639 pounds in 1915. Alaska mines and quarries in 1924 also produced tin, coal, marble and gypsum to an estimated value of \$2,790,000, an increase of \$1,400,000 over 1915. The total value of Alaska's mineral production since 1880, when mining first began, is, in round figures, \$506,000,000, or more than 70 times

the sum paid to Russia for the territory.

"Alaska at the present time is on the crest of an unparalleled era of good times, and the figures show that trade between the territory and the United States will be two and one-half times greater for 1925 than for 1915.

"The increase of gold production, the development of the railroad, agriculture, and forest enterprises, and the steady gain in population have worked to bring about the doubling of the business.

"The progress made in the treatment of low-grade gold and copper-bearing ores, within recent years, has been little short of marvelous, and is now so eminently successful as to warrant the statement that what has been achieved will be followed by further successes in the treatment of the vast bodies of high and low grade ores which are found in all parts of Alaska, and await only better transportation facilities to invite the attention of the capital necessary to make them productive.

"Do you know that long before California was more than a myth, before the Columbia was discovered, before there was a United States, Alaska had been explored and settled? If Chinese records are to be believed, the discovery of Alaska antedates the journeys of the Norsemen to Greenland and across the Atlantic.

"According to the records, a Chinese Buddhist priest traversed the Alaskan shore in 499 A.D. In 1711 the Cossacks of Russia were

hunting sable in Alaska. In 1724 Peter the Great with his own hand wrote the instructions for the expedition that led to the discovery and exploration of Bering Sea, and in the following century Spanish, English and French navigators again and again headed for the Alaskan coast in a vain effort to find the northwest passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic. The records of these explorations constitute a most important part of the history of America.

"My friends, you know I am a 'Sourdough.' I have made many trips to Alaska. I am one of the Pioneers of Alaska. I belong to the Arctic Brotherhood. Years ago I said that Alaska was the wonderland of the world. I reiterate that. Nine-tenths of the people of the country have no idea of the vastness of her boundaries; the extent of her domain; the grandeur of her scenery; the salubrity of her climate; the wonder of her mountains; the length of her rivers; the tremendousness of her water powers; the possibilities of her fisheries; the greatness of her forests; the grazing advantages in her valleys for sheep and cattle; her untouched agricultural resources; her incalculable mineral wealth, and her splendid homes for the multitude in the land up there that spells opportunity for the earnest worker and the brave pioneer.

"I have seen much of Alaska—and I know. Last summer I was through the Copper River valley, the White River valley, the Chisana valley, the Tanana valley, the Yukon valley,

and the Chandalar valley—all great valleys—rich beyond the dreams of avarice in mineral wealth, agricultural possibilities, and material resources. These valleys must now be opened to the people. Transportation will do it. The railroad must be extended. I shall do my part to this accomplishment. According to Government reports these valleys can feed and support a population of ten millions of people.

“With transportation, and greater development, these sections of Alaska will undoubtedly become the richest gold and copper districts in the world and will furnish sustenance and industry to millions of hardy people. They will be cattle people and agriculturists, who will supply foodstuffs to the people living in the large cities of the world. Wheat, oats and barley can be grown in these great valleys to greater advantage than anywhere else in the world, to say nothing of hardy vegetables, like potatoes, turnips, rutabagas, carrots, onions, cabbages, celery, and cauliflower. This is on account of the soil and climatic conditions.

“You may say that I am an Alaskan enthusiast—and so I am; but the things I said about Alaska a quarter of a century ago are true today, and every one of my predictions now will come true in the next twenty-five years.

“Years ago I said that Alaska was God’s country, and the wonderland of the world. For health, for climate, for scenery, and material resources, it is the greatest land on the

face of the globe. Alaska, that's all! See it! See it first—and you will agree with me about it, and become, as I became, an Alaska Booster.

"I repeat now what I have often said before—that Alaska is the wonderland of the world—God's country. No words can adequately describe it. It is the poor man's, and the sick man's, and the rich man's, and the sportsman's paradise. See Alaska First! Alaska is the natural art gallery of the universe.

"The time, in my judgment, is at hand when this vast territory must be developed by American genius, American capital, and American enterprise, and take my word for it, there will be no more healthy and prosperous section in all our progressive country for American brawn and American brain. Alaska is the place for the new settler—for the hustler—for the man who wants to go ahead and get on.

"Politically speaking, Alaska wants her rights—that's all! Alaska must have her rights. Alaska must be a State in the Union. That is destiny.

"Visit this northern wonderland. See it for yourself. Alaska extends the glad hand of fellowship. Alaska with her increasing population of patriotic people; Alaska with her invigorating climate; Alaska with her beautiful scenery; her magnificent distances; her snow-capped mountains; her majestic rivers; her fertile fields; her great industries of fish, and fur, and timber; Alaska with her great agricultural possibilities; Alaska with her im-

mense wealth in gold, and copper, and silver, and lead, and tin, and iron, and oil, and coal—mineral wealth beyond the dreams of the most imaginative person in the world; Alaska with her brave, and loyal, and patriotic, and God-fearing, American citizens; Alaska with her churches and her schools; her splendid public institutions; her towns and her villages; Alaska under the splendors of the northern lights and in the shadow of the midnight sun; Alaska with her inspiring sights, her ancient glaciers; Alaska with her great harbors, and innumerable lakes and countless cascades; Alaska in the name of all these, and more, bids you come and see—bids you welcome to all her wealth; to all her grandeur; to all her greatness; and to all her glory!”

(From Editorial in Nome Nugget, July 10, 1924.)

To Governor William Sulzer

No matter what they call you in the East in Alaska you will always be known as "Sourdough Bill"—because you are one of us; because you climbed Chilkoot Pass in the Klondike rush; because you knew every camp in the Yukon; because you were in the Nome stampede; because you wintered in the Arctic: because you helped organize and are a life member of the Pioneers, the Eagles, the Walrus Society, the Alaska Sourdoughs, and the Arctic Brotherhood; and last but not least, because you have done more for Alaska than any man in America, living or dead, and with an eloquence—unsurpassed—can sing her story, and sound her epic.

You're getting old, Bill! Your mushing days are o'er; but you don't change much—you are the same old Bill—genial, sunshiny, and democratic.

From all that we can see you still have the vision of the seer; the pep of the pioneer; the enthusiasm of youth, and the maternal love of the Great Northland.

We are glad you are with us again in Nome. The boys from the creeks, and all of us—welcome you with fraternal greetings that

bring to memory many fond recollections of the good old days—gone forever!

We are glad to meet "Old Bill Sulzer" again tonight, for he is a type of a vanishing race. Years ago, in company with another Oldtimer, General Greeley, we walked the streets of Chena together when 10,000 others were walking those streets because they would not lead trumps. Those were the Good Old Days. Where thrived Chena is not even a monument to mark the spot. Gone are the Steamboat Days and the Romances of the Stampede, leaving behind them only moving pictures of "Frosty Passions," "Lures of the Yukon" and troubles of the "Chechacos." But "Old Bill Sulzer" is still here and just as stubborn and determined as ever, and we ought to have a session tonight where no dictograph can listen in, nor politics intrude.

Last year we had with us a President. Tonight we have with us a man who was nominated for President and refused the nomination—in 1916. Between the Masons, and the Democrats, and the Alaska Pioneers, he ought to be made to feel at home in Our Town.

We listen to your optimism about Alaska, and her coming glory; about the new strike and the next stampede; about helping Dan Sutherland in Congress; about the money you will get for Judge Bunnell to go forward with our College; about helping Col. Steese build the roads, and the trails, and the bridges; about extending the Government railroad from Fairbanks to McCarthy; about opening up the

Chandalar, the Tanana, the Chisana, and the White River Valleys; about dissipating the clouds of ignorance in the East concerning Alaska, and the greatness of her undeveloped resources.

We listen, "Bill"—and it all sounds good to us.

You're a real he-man, "Bill"—a true Sourdough—a genuine Alaskan.

Quit the effete East, "Bill." You don't belong there. Come back to us. We welcome you. Our homes are open to you. The Northern lights shine for you. Our hearthsides long for you. Alaska—our Alaska—wants you—and there is nothing she has to give that you can't have—if you want it.

Welcome, "Bill"! Thrice welcome to your old stamping ground. All Alaska salutes you!

*(Reprinted from the Ketchikan Chronicle,
June 26, 1924.)*

The Call of the North

Read and dedicated to "Sourdough Bill" Sulzer, at a Great Potlach in his honor in the Igloo of Ketchikan:

'Tis the spirit of Alaska that is calling me
tonight;
As I dream in New York City, where the
lights are always bright;
And I long to see the rugged coast and
snow-capped peaks on high;
Oh, take me to Alaska! Take me back before
I die.

I can see the coast range glistening, crowned
with everlasting snow;
I can hear the river roaring in the valley far
below;
I can feel the cool of evening as the sun
sinks out of sight;
'Tis the Spirit of Alaska that is calling me
tonight.

I can hear the wind a-sighing through the
tree-tops dark and tall;
I can hear the wolves a-calling as they band
up in the fall;

(25)

Well I know their every action as they vanish
out of sight;
'Tis the Spirit of Alaska that is calling me
tonight.

I can hear the city calling and I know the
maddening throng.
As I watch the toil-worn faces of the people
pass along;
But the Spirit of Alaska—with its ever
changing light,
Is calling me to leave New York for my
northern home tonight.

(The above poem was read by the author
of the poem and dedicated to Hon. William
Sulzer by Igloo No. 16, Pioneers of Alaska,
upon the occasion of a reception tendered to
Mr. Sulzer at Ketchikan, Alaska, on June 25,
1924. Mr. Sulzer was made a life member of
Igloo No. 1, at Nome, in 1907.)

The Prospector

By WM. SULZER

Former Governor of New York

The prospector is the most useful man to commerce and the most valuable man to civilization. No prospectors, no mines. No mines, no civilization.

Political economists tell us that mining, next to agriculture, is the greatest industry.

This is true from the viewpoint, that if our soil were untilled famine would stalk the land.

From a monetary standpoint, however, the mining industry is the greatest in the world. The truth of this assertion becomes apparent when it is visualized that mining gives us the standard of value by which the price of everything produced by the brain and brawn of man is measured.

Abandon mining and the value of every commodity would be insignificant, humanity would sink back to the barter and exchange age, and financial paralysis would lock in its viselike grasp the industries of mankind. It would be the greatest calamity that ever befell the human race, and in less than a century civilization would revert to barbarism, when primitive man knew nothing about copper, gold, silver, iron, lead, zinc, and the

mineral resources of Mother Earth.

Those who decry mining are ignorant of history. If they know anything about metals they must know that all business; that all industry; and that all human progress depends on the mines.

The wealth from the mines from the dawn of time is the epic of human advancement—of man's heroic march along the paths of progress.

Show me a people without mines, and I will show you a people deep in the mire of poverty and a thousand years behind the procession of civilization. It was the mines that made the greatness of the past; that made the ancient civilizations; that made Egypt great; that made Greece great; that made Rome great; and in modern times the mines have made Spain, England, and the United States rich beyond the dreams of avarice.

Mining is essential to the progress of civilization. Mining has done more for the human race than all other agencies combined. Mining has made more poor men millionaires than all other things put together.

More real profit has been made by investors in mining securities during the past century than in any other industry.

Strike down the miner; shackle mining; throttle the mining industry, and civilization will sink back to poverty and stagnation.

The greatest benefactor of the human race

(28)

has been the prospector. The most beneficent men of all time are the far seeing men whose brain and brawn developed the earth's natural resources—the men who poured the golden streams of mineral wealth into the lap of civilization; into the channels of trade; into the avenues of commerce; and into the homes of happiness.

All honor to the miner! All hail the prospector!

Iron—The Basis of Civilization

By WM. SULZER

Former Governor of New York

Iron is the most useful and the most important mineral on earth. We can get along without gold and silver, but civilization cannot get along without iron. Without iron humanity would still be in the dawn period.

How iron was discovered no one knows; but the story is told, and perhaps it is true, that thousands of years ago a camel driver made a fire, where the desert met the mountains, in ancient Chaldea. He surrounded the fire with rocks, or float, from the surrounding hills. During the night the fire melted the rocks. In the morning the camel driver saw a small piece of melted iron which the fire had smelted from the rocks. He took it to an alchemist, who found that by heating it, and then hammering it, the metal could be moulded and tempered into different shapes. This was the beginning of the Iron Age.

History tells us that the Assyrians were the first people to utilize iron for war. They used it for their spear-points and arrow-heads, and by reason of these weapons, they came down like the wolf on the fold, and captured about everything in the Near East.

The Bible tells us in Genesis, Chapter 4,

Verse 22, that Tubal-cain was an instructor of workers in iron. Long afterwards Solon, the Greek law giver, and philosopher, visited Croesus. The latter was then the richest man in the world on account of the gold he possessed. He took great pride in showing it to Solon, and asked the great Greek his opinion. "You have much gold," said Solon, "but if a man should come with iron he will take it away from you." Solon's prophecy came true. Cyrus came with iron, conquered Croesus, and took away all his hoards of gold.

The discoverer of iron was one of the greatest benefactors in the world. He deserves the commendation of humanity, and a monument to his memory should be erected in every civilized country.

If there were no iron there would be no steel; no ferro alloys; no steam; no factories; and no manufacturers. The farmer would still be plowing with a crooked stick; wars would be fought with clubs; there would be no railroads; no ships on the Seven Seas; and civilization would be where it was in the Stone Age.

Old Mother Nature created iron. She put some of it in everything that lives. Besides she realized how important this metal would be to human beings, and for that reason she distributed it, with a generous hand, throughout the earth.

The symbol of iron is Fe. Its atomic weight is 55.85. On account of its abundance it has been mined, worked, and utilized from a most

distant period. From its discovery to the present time, geologically speaking, the world has been in the "Iron Age," notwithstanding what a few say about the Bronze Age and the Electric Age. The truth is that there have only been two Ages in the history of mankind, viz: the Stone Age and the Iron Age; and we are still in the "Iron Age." If there were no iron there would be no hydro-electric plants, and no utilization of electricity. Civilization would be in the ox-team stage of development and transportation.

Since the discovery of iron great progress has been made, during the intervening centuries, so that today, from a chemical and metallurgical viewpoint, the basis of all progress, of all manufacturing, of all advancement, in war and in peace, here and everywhere, is due to the production, the manufacture, and the utilization of iron. It is the basis of every industry, and the vanguard of every step along the great highway of humanity. So long as the supply is available civilization will march on to higher, and better, and greater things for the benefit of all concerned.

All honor to the discoverer of iron! All hail iron—the most essential metal in the universe!

"Are Minerals Alive?"

By WM. SULZER

Former Governor of New York

When I was a small boy, living on an old farm, at Wheatsheaf, New Jersey, I wandered often in the fields, and the woods, and along the brooks. Nature appealed to me. Everything I saw, and everything I heard, was interesting and educational.

Among the things, in which I was much interested, were rocks, and stones, and pebbles. Whenever I found one that looked odd, or different, I brought it home and put it in my collection, on shelves I had made back of the corn crib. Every day I would study these specimens, and was careful to exclude duplicates. Unfortunately I could not classify them, or tell much about them, and none of the farmers in our neighborhood could give me any satisfactory information. They just thought I was a queer boy.

Little did I dream, at that time, that I was a mineral collector, and studying geology. However, as the years came and went I followed this inclination, and have always been a collector of minerals, and a student of the rocks. They tell the Truth. Nothing has ever interested me so much as Geology. Looking back over a long career I have often

wished that I had selected Geology, instead of law, as my lifework and profession.

It is my judgment that Geology is the greater science. It is the most useful, and the most utilitarian. It tells the story of the earth on which we live. The more we find out about "Old Mother Earth" the greater we become in material benefits; in health; in progress; in happiness; and in enlightenment. All that we are, and all that we hope to be, comes from the earth. By the application of brain and brawn to the resources of Nature we make the world richer, and greater, and humanity happier, along the great highways of civilization.

Many years ago I was on Jumbo Mountain, on the West Coast of Prince of Wales Island, Southeastern Alaska. On this mountain there is found almost every mineral known in the world. It is one of the greatest places on earth to study geology and mineralogy. With me on that occasion were Dr. Alfred Brooks, of the United States Geological Survey; Major Henry G. Catlin, one of the foremost mining engineers of his time; and U.S. Senator John P. Jones, of Nevada, a successful mining man, and one of the ablest statesmen of our country.

After our dinner one night we were sitting in front of our cabin, high up on the mountainside, smoking our pipes.

From early boyhood I had the habit of asking questions about matters in which I was interested. In this way I often received

valuable information. We had been studying the geology, and mineral resources of Jumbo Mountain, for several weeks. On this night I asked my companions the question: "Are Minerals Alive?" They stared at me. The first to answer was Senator Jones. He said: "Quien sabe?" In reply I said: "Senator, the animal world is alive. The vegetable world is alive. Why not the mineral world?"

Then Major Catlin said that I had propounded a most interesting question; but that he had never given the question sufficient study, as a mining engineer, to deny or affirm the proposition. Dr. Brooks had listened attentively. When I asked him for his opinion he replied: "Sulzer, you have asked one of the greatest questions in science. I have thought about it, but have reached no conclusion. As you have asked the question, perhaps you have given the matter sufficient investigation to vouchsafe an opinion."

"Gentlemen," I said, "You admit you do not know. So far as I am advised no scientist has ever advanced the theory that the mineral world is just as much alive as the animal world, or the vegetable world. I have thought much about it. My opinion is that the mineral world is alive. It is very much older than the vegetable world, and the vegetable world is very much older than the animal world. I believe there has been animal life on our planet for several million years; that there has been vegetable life on our planet for several million years more; and that

there has been mineral life on our planet for more than a billion years. Mineral life came first, and paved the way for vegetable life. Vegetable life came second, and paved the way for animal life. Observation, investigation, and deduction prove it beyond peradventure. No mineral life, no vegetable life. No vegetable life, no animal life.

"Minerals are a part of matter, and all matter is alive. The only permanent thing is change. Everything that lives in the stellar universe is subject to this law of change, or as some people say—evolution. Matter is eternal; it is without cause; without origin; and without end. All matter is alive, and in constant flux and motion. Matter is never at rest. Mineral life follows, like everything else, the infinite law of change. Its transmutation, or metamorphosis, is often so slow that the human intellect is incapable of the perception; but change goes on. Mineral atoms, and electrons, like all other life, are subject to this universal law, the potentialities of which are energy, and energy reduced to its final analysis is pure electrons. The conservation of energy, in its various forms, means that matter—all matter—is alive; that it is in constant motion; and forever indestructible. Minerals, which are a part of matter, are alive, and always in motion. There is nothing at rest. The transformations are merely changes from one form of matter to another, and all according to "Old Mother Nature's" great law of Change."

When I finished Dr. Brooks said: "Mr. Sulzer, assuming that you are right, and there is much in your argument, then you have made one of the greatest discoveries in the history of Science."

Since then other scientists have confirmed my conclusions. I have verified them. Therefore I now assert, as a fact, that minerals are alive, and I challenge science to successfully controvert my assertion.

The Birth of the Earth

By WM. SULZER

Former Governor of New York

More than a billion years ago, as we reckon time, the earth was born. It was born like everything else. Everything in the animal world, the mineral world, and the vegetable world is born, and lives, and dies. The union of a male and a female produces birth. All life is the union of these forces. This is the primal law of the stellar universe. It runs like a silver cord through all matter. Even the great stars are born.

Our Earth is a member of the Solar system, the third in distance from the sun, and the largest within the orbit of Jupiter. Its spherical form was taught by Pythagoras, and other Greek thinkers and teachers. Its natural history is the most interesting, instructive, and educational in literature. Besides it plays an important part in astronomy, as the diameter of the earth is the unit by which all celestial distances are determined.

Scientists have enunciated several theories concerning the birth of the earth, but I do not agree with these theories, and some of them have been exploded. From much thought, investigation, and observation, I believe I have discovered the truth about the birth of

this little planet, on which we live, and which we call the earth.

The biggest thing in our ken, and this has been so from primitive times, is the small star we call the sun, far out in space from the Island Universe we call the "Milky Way." In early times the people worshipped this little star, because it gave them light and heat, and other essentials to life. The sun-worshippers were the first true religionists, and the ancient cult has today a substantial following throughout the world. Nearly all gods are sun gods, and all religions have been built from them, and around them.

Although the sun has been studied since civilization began it is only in recent years that science is finding out a few important things about it. Our sun is the creator, and the only agency that creates. The word "creator," or "creates," or "created," should never be used by writers or speakers except in reference to our sun. The sun, in the last analysis, is "Old Mother Nature." The sun is the mother, and should always be called She. Our little planet, called the earth, is just one of her children. How did this occur? That question I shall now answer.

Billions and billions of years ago our star, called the sun, was a double star. There are many of these double stars in the stellar universe that can be seen through the great telescopes. Our star was then a female star, and much smaller than it is now, but it was growing into womanhood. Approaching it was

a larger star, that had reached its maturity and was a male star. Then these two stars met and were married. This celestial union was the greatest sight to be witnessed within the sphere of our solar system. Only a vivid imagination can visualize its glory and its grandeur. From the marriage of these two stars—male and female—were born the earth, and all the other planets; and doubtless there are other undiscovered planets, of which we know nothing at present; but they are all the children of the marriage of these two small stars far out from the Milky Way.

The male star, of course, after the marriage, died and was absorbed by the female star called our sun. As the children were born they went out, and were distributed in space, but always watched over and controlled by their wonderful mother—the sun. When they left their mother they were in a gaseous state. How long this lasted we have no knowledge, but the gases gradually cooled into liquids, and some of the liquids then became solids, and the planet earth, after millions and millions of years, was formed, and grew slowly: and is still growing, and changing, through forces and agencies of its mother, which I will refer to in my next article entitled: "How Old Is Sol?"

"How Old is Sol?"

By WM. SULZER

Former Governor of New York

Every person interested in Rocks, and Minerals, should know much about Geology, and something about Astronomy. Our earth, in the Stellar Universe, is a little grain of sand on the limitless shore of infinite space. Yet everything in and on this planet is made of the same stuff as the stars. Every living thing is made of the same elements we find in the most distant nebulae, and the same natural laws guide our activities, and control our destinies.

Astronomy is the story of the stellar universe. It is a sad commentary, on the progress of human intelligence, that so many people know so little about Astronomy.

The ancient Arabs, in Chaldea; the ancient wise men in Egypt; and the ancient philosophers in China, thousands of years ago, without modern mechanical instruments, named the stars; mapped the constellations; and knew almost as much about the great Island Universes, in space, as we do now. The Greeks, in later times, derived their knowledge of the stellar universe from these peoples, and the Greeks classified it for future generations.

However, all the stars, except the star we

call the Sun, are so far away from the earth that they have practically no influence on our planet. Some progress, nevertheless, is being made. These giant stars in space are now being studied through powerful telescopes.

From very distant epochs humans have observed the star nearest the earth which we call the Sun. Every ancient people had a different name for this star. The Romans, and the Spanish people, call it "Sol." The French call it "Soleil." The Germanic people called it "Sonne." From this latter word came the Anglo-Saxon word "Sun."

As explained in a previous article, entitled "The Birth of the Earth," our Sun is a female star. She was married. Her husband—a male star—died shortly after the marriage. All the planets, in our solar system, are the children of this marriage. She is more than 93,000,000 miles distant from the earth. Her diameter is 864,375 miles. Her circumference is 2,593,125 miles. She is, comparatively speaking, a small star, belonging to the great island universe we call the "Milky Way," and far out in space from its confines.

However, our Sun is no mean star. She is very much alive, and exceedingly bright. According to my mathematical calculations, she was born about three trillion years ago. She is now in her prime and will live, unless something unforeseen happens, for at least three trillion years to come. So long as she lives she will give life, and heat, and light, and power, to the earth. In view of these

mathematical calculations no one need be alarmed about the end of the earth.

Stars are born, and live, and die, like all other things. The life of a star is about a thousand trillion years. A trillion years, according to the French system of enumeration, which is followed in the United States, is 1,000,000,000,000 years, which constitute a long period of life for Mrs. Sol if you figure it out mathematically.

Our Sun is "Old Mother Nature." She is the "Creator" of everything in and on the earth. She is the source of all life; of all power; of all heat; of all light; of all motion; and of all matter. Her laws are immutable. If anyone should ask you can say for me she is a mighty hot mama, having a temperature of about 2,000 degrees Centigrade on her surface, and about 6,000 degrees Centigrade in her interior. It is almost impossible for anyone to conceive of such heat; and such power; and such energy. As she grows old she will gradually cool off, but the change is so slow that one must come back a trillion years from now to detect it.

In his great book on the Stars, Mr. Newcomb says:

"Each star goes through changes analogous to those of a human being from birth to old age. In its infancy a star is simply a nebulous mass; it gradually condenses into a smaller volume, growing hotter . . . until a stage of maximum temperature is reached, when it begins to cool off."

The Sun does not set or rise. When we hear people speak of sunsets, and sunrises, it simply means they are referring to the rotation of the earth on its axis from West to East. The Sun also revolves on her axis every twenty-six days. She is spherical in shape, and very beautiful. She is our only accurate timepiece. She has other motions, like the earth, which are not necessary to mention here, except to say that she is traveling, in a straight line, at the rate of fourteen miles a second, with all her planets, toward the great star Vega in the constellation of Lyra.

During 1910 when I was traveling in Guatemala I saw a native, sitting on his doorstep, gazing at the Sun. The man interested me.

"What are you looking at, Senor?" I asked.

"Old Sol, senor," he replied.

"How old is Sol?" I inquired.

"Quien sabe, senor?" he answered.

During the Middle Ages it was the fashion to belittle our Sun. They said it was an "insignificant" star. Since then we have learned that although it is exceeded in intrinsic brightness, or candle power, by many of the stars, it is much brighter than the great majority of them.

Dr. A. Van Maanen, of the Mount Wilson Observatory, recently remarked that of the 100 stars within a distance of 30 light years, from the earth, only twenty are brighter than our Sun, while more than seventy are five magnitudes fainter, and emit, respectively, less than one hundredth, and one ten-thou-

sandth, as much light as the Sun.

There are no fixed stars. That theory of the ancients has for years been exploded. Everything in the stellar universe is in constant motion, and sometimes at velocities that stagger the finite mind.

Years ago when I went to Congress I made it a rule, when I was not busy attending to my official duties, to go to the various bureaus of the Government, and learn everything I could about them. In pursuit of these endeavors I often went to the Naval Observatory, then in charge of Simon Newcomb. We became friends. He was the greatest astronomer since Isaac Newton. Many scientists say that Simon Newcomb was the greatest man ever born on the Western Hemisphere. Whenever the nights were clear, and I had nothing else to do, I went to the Naval Observatory and watched Mr. Newcomb studying the stellar universe. He interested me in astronomy. He gave me his books to read, and I studied them. No better books on astronomy were ever written. They should be taught in all our schools. I never interrupted Mr. Newcomb when he was at work, but when he had leisure I talked with him, and learned much. He prepared, and issued for our government, the Nautical Almanac, which is the Bible of all the men who sail the Seven Seas. He had an associate named Albert A. Michelson, afterwards connected with the University of Chicago.

One night, when I was present, Mr. Michel-

son asked Mr. Newcomb if he had estimated the velocity of light. He said he had. Then he got out a small book, and showed us by figures that the speed of light was 186,244 miles a second, which would be about a trillion miles a year. This was one of the greatest discoveries in astronomy. In after years Professor Michelson proved beyond successful contradiction that Mr. Newcomb was right.

On another occasion I asked Mr. Newcomb this question: "If our solar system is traveling towards Vega, at the rate of 14 miles a second, how long will it take us to get there?" "That," said Mr. Newcomb, "depends on how fast Vega is moving away from us." I learned much from Mr. Newcomb regarding the stellar universe. I owe him a debt which can never be paid. The things he told me induced me to study the stars. At his suggestion I was instrumental, as a member of Congress, in establishing the Astrophysical Laboratory, in Washington, through which agency much accurate information concerning our Sun has been obtained.

The greatest thing that can be seen by mortals on this planet is our Sun, and especially her corona. The corona can be seen with smoked glasses during any eclipse. It is indescribable, and a stellar sight that staggers the imagination. It is the most superb spectacle that we can see in the stellar universe.

Many scientists have discussed the sun spots, and have speculated about them more

or less intelligently. None of these scientists, so far as I am aware, has ascertained the truth about these sun spots. From careful study, and observation, I am convinced these sun spots are magnetic storms that sweep a part of the surface of the Sun. They come to the surface, from the depths, on account of subterranean disturbances. Sometimes they are small, and then become large, but when we see them they are all surface phenomena. They come and go, at regular periods, just like storms on this planet. What effect they have on the earth has not, as yet, been satisfactorily determined.

It is my judgment that we are only on the threshold of knowledge concerning our Sun. I look far in the future. I see the day when her tremendous energies will be utilized by man to give the people of the earth all the heat, light, and power they will ever require, for every comfort; for every purpose; and for every mechanical device now invented, or hereafter to be invented, and constructed, by the imaginative genius of the human brain.

All hail Mother "Sol"! Long may she live to bless the earth—and all living things in this good "Old World" of ours.

Of Time and Space

By WM. SULZER
Former Governor of New York

Our word time comes from the old Saxon-English word *tima*. It is not related to the Latin word *tempus*.

Time is measurement from one event, or period, to another event, or period. It is the distance of duration or succession, either in whole or in part, from one time to another time.

What we call time is measured by successive intervals. The astronomical information for this statement is the rotation of the earth, which, from remotest antiquity, has been employed as a measurement. Astronomers use what they call *sidereal time*, and regulate their chronometers accordingly. Many ancient people measured time by the moon—called *lunar time*. Now the countries of the world, for ordinary purposes, use *solar time*, which means the successive returns of the sun to the meridian; but neither *lunar time*, nor *solar time*, was ever an accurate measurement. The Mayan people fixed their time by the transit of Venus, which according to astronomers made the most accurate calendar of any people in the history of the world.

More than 7,000 years ago the wise men of

India saw four planets in conjunction. So far as they knew this had never happened before. It was a marvelous sight. They called it the "Caliyoga." Then they decreed that it should constitute the year one, and that every 600 years thereafter a Hindu god, or sacred person, should be born. This reckoning was subsequently adopted by other people in the East, but most of them changed the number of years to suit their own views, history, or tribal traditions. Astronomers now know that these four planets are in conjunction every 28,000 years.

When the Roman Senate decreed Augustus Caesar god, and made his person sacred, they adopted a new calendar, and made his birthday the year one—Anno Domini. They also named our days and months. Their calendar, however, was so inaccurate that centuries afterwards it had to be reformed by adding ten days. This change made it more accurate, but it is now far from being correct.

The story of time, throughout the earth, is one of constant change. As a matter of fact there is no such thing as "Time." It is a mere figment of the imagination, and has nothing to do with the stellar universe. Nevertheless, I hope the day is not far distant when the wisest and the greatest scientists in the world will meet, and agree upon a more accurate and utilitarian system of measurement than we have at present. Our days, months, and years should be so arranged that our calendar will be more accurate, and excite

less derision and confusion. Our calendar now is archaic, and out of line with scientific knowledge.

Regarding space, that is quite a different proposition. Space is a fact. We can see it. We know it. It has no center, and no circumference. It had no beginning, and can have no end. It is occupied by all the matter in the stellar universe, of which our earth, and our sun, are infinitesimal grains of sand on the shoreless sea of interstellar space. So I assert, from study, observation, and reflection, without fear of successful contradiction, the following, viz:

FIRST. Space has no limitations. It is not expanding or contracting. It is infinite.

SECOND. Matter is scattered here and there throughout space. Matter is alive, and in continuous flux, which means change and transformation. If all the matter we know about in space was united it would mean, so far as space is concerned, just about as much as an atom in the rotunda of the Pennsylvania Railroad Station. It is hard to visualize this, but it is true. Matter, like space, is infinite and indestructible. The natural state of matter is not *rest* but *motion*. Everything moves; everything changes. There is nothing permanent but change—metamorphism. For every action there is reaction—of equal force, and opposite in direction.

THIRD. Motion—a universal natural law like change. All matter is in constant motion. There is nothing static, and the law of mo-

tion is perpetual. Motion is force; and force is energy; and energy in its last analysis is pure electricity. This law of motion applies to every atom and electron in space.

These natural laws which apply to space, matter, and motion are eternal and immutable. The knowledge of these natural laws, and their application, constitute all that we know concerning the stellar universe.

Now and then a few Physicists advance the theory that time and space are one—three parts space and one part time. This, they tell us, is the recipe for the cosmos. However, a little thought will prove to any logical brain that this theory is erroneous. As there is no time, and time does not exist, it follows as a logical conclusion that time cannot be a part of space. Any theory to the contrary is preposterous.

We also hear much in recent days about "Relativity"—especially from Professor Einstein. Relativity is as old as the mountains. It was taught, thousands of years ago, by the wise men of India; then by the sages of Chaldea; and from their teachings the Greeks learned about it. Some of the greatest of the ancient Greeks declared that everything in the stellar universe was relative. Before Professor Einstein spoke, or wrote, about it several German philosophers and English scientists asserted the doctrine.

I have read everything Professor Einstein has written, and so far as I can find out he has made no discovery, nor added an iota to

the sum of human knowledge. There is no doubt about his ability as a mathematician, but there has been nothing added to mathematics since Newton.

Hegel boasted that only one person in the world understood him. Einstein boasts that only about a dozen people in the world understand him. Hegel was in error, and Einstein is laboring under a delusion. Einstein's abracadabra, like that of many of his predecessors, in the classic word of Henry Ford is "Bunk." Therefore I assert, without fear of successful contradiction by any scientist, that all life is relative; that all matter is relative; and that they are controlled by the immutable laws of "Old Mother Nature."

Mr. Sulzer's Tribute to Mining

Ages ago Old Mother Nature built stronger vaults in her mountain banks than we have in ours. She filled these vaults with gold, silver and copper. She gave the prospector insight, and guided him on his way to the door of these vaults. The federal government handed him a title patent to all therein. It is not a crime, but a virtue to enter. With drill, blast, pick and spade the prospector has broken the combination locks and entered. But for him our notes of issue would be as the stump-tailed currency of 1837. But for him our government would be bankrupt.

Mines will be producing millions of gold, silver, iron, tin, and copper in the future when national banks are only a sad recollection.

A mine contains a crop already raised, harvested, and on deposit for you to check against at your pleasure. The wealth gathered from the mines immortalized Croesus, and King Solomon, and advanced civilization.

Show me a country without mines and I will show you a people sunk in poverty; and poverty makes cowards of nations as well as men.

Mining has made the United States the richest country in the world. It is an industry as necessary to the welfare of the people as the raising of crops.

Mining is the second industry in the United States. It has transformed more poor men into millionaires than any other business. The record shows it has scored less than 35 percent of failures against 75 percent of failures in general business. Without the products of the mines we would have neither a frying pan, or a monetary medium.

Eliminate the miner and you put civilization back to the cave man.

Wm. Sulzer

Counselor at Law

115 Broadway

New York

November 16, 1920.

Editor of the New York World.

Sir:

Why not write an editorial in favor of a Convention to revise the Federal Constitution? Such an editorial will command the commendation of the thinking people of our country.

For many years, as you know, I have advocated a Convention to revise the Federal Constitution in order to bring it up-to-date, and make it workable. A long experience in the Congress convinces me that our organic law is archaic and unworkable. By virtue of some of its antiquated provisions, about half the time, the government fails to function. How can it be otherwise when we consider that the United States is trying now to do business with a political machine that has been out of gear for more than half a century.

Every student of our political history knows that there are things in the present Constitu-

tion that should be taken out; and that there are things out that should be put in it.

It is my judgment that the most immediate need of government in the United States is to change our present out-of-date governmental system of checks and balances—mis-called a representative government—to a genuine parliamentary Democracy that shall be responsive to the people, and responsible to the people.

We can bring this about only by a Constitutional Convention, which should provide, among other fundamentals, for the following, viz.,

1. A single term for President.
2. No Vice-President. No Senate.
3. The direct nomination, and the direct election, of Federal Officials to the Executive, the Judicial, and the Legislative branches of the government.
4. A single legislative body, with a cabinet, elected from its membership, and responsive to the direction of its majority, to conduct the political, the diplomatic, and the business affairs of the government.

If you will make a campaign for a Constitutional Convention, I feel confident success will crown your efforts, and through this agency the voters will get the reforms es-

(56)

sential to make the United States Government function efficiently, economically, progressively, and intelligently.

Very respectfully,

Wm. Sulzer.

Note: This letter was published in the New York World. Frank Cobb, then the editor, wrote a page editorial in favor of the proposition. Other newspapers did likewise.

[Extract from Congressional Record, February 7, 1899.]

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,
ON "THE DAY WE CELEBRATE,"
BEFORE THE
JACKSON CLUB, OF OMAHA, NEBR.,
Saturday Evening, January 7, 1899.

[Reprinted from the Omaha World-Herald, January 8, 1899.]

WASHINGTON.
1899.

"The Day We Celebrate."

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

[From the *Omaha World-Herald*, January 8, 1899.]

Congressman WILLIAM SULZER spoke as follows:

Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is a matter of much personal gratification to me to be with you to-night and participate in your joyous and magnificent celebration of Jackson's day.

I would be false to myself and to every sentiment of gratitude I possess and hold dear if I did not at the very beginning of my remarks express to you how deeply and sincerely I appreciate the honor and the distinguished compliment of your invitation. I accepted it, of course. I could not do otherwise. Coming from whence it did, and how it did, I could not refuse. I am very glad, indeed, to be with you, and as long as I live I shall never forget your courtesy, your reception, your consideration, and your hearty and genuine hospitality.

I like the Democrats of the great West, and I hope they will like me.

I stand squarely on the Chicago platform, and as a Democrat, tried and true to every tenet of our party and to its fundamental principles, I come to you from the toiling, throbbing, earnest Democrats of the East, and bring you their fraternal greeting, and their message of hope for union and harmony in our ranks, and for the triumphant victory of our grand old party for years to come.

In my judgment, we are destined to triumph if we religiously adhere to our principles, fearlessly and vigorously promulgate them, and honestly and tenaciously strive to enforce them. We must be true to ourselves and to the teachings of the fathers of Democracy, and if we are and continue to have faith in the justice of our cause, we must and will succeed, and signal victory must and will crown our efforts.

We celebrate to-day one of the most important epochs in the annals of our history.

This is Andrew Jackson's day, sacred to the memory of the hero of New Orleans, sacred to the memory of the grand old man, the old hickory of the Democratic party, sacred to the memory of one of the most unique, one of the most stalwart, and one of the most magnificent figures and characters in all American history.

Andrew Jackson was a hero from his cradle to his grave. Irresistible events and circumstances beyond his control made him so.

The fascinating story of his life reads like a romance and demonstrates that truth is stranger than fiction. That story is a part of the most stirring and eventful period in our history, an incentive to every hopeful schoolboy, a beacon to every sincere patriot, a star of hope to every struggling toiler, and a conclusive proof of the stability and the opportunity of democratic institutions.

Andrew Jackson from his birth to his bier was a remarkable personage. He was a man of iron will and of indomitable spirit. His veins were filled with good red blood, but his nerves were of steel. He never knew fear. He never turned his back on friend or foe. He knew the right and never hesitated to do it. He hated cant, despised hypocrisy, and cared naught for consequences.

He was a plain man. He loved the plain people; they understood him and they loved him.

He was a forceful man, a direct man, a positive man, an honest man, and a truthful man. He hated a liar, and he spurned with contempt a coward.

His life began with the struggles of a brave people to cast off the tyrannous yoke of oppression, and when it went out his last look witnessed the greatest and the grandest Republic the world has ever seen.

His life was a part of the Republic, and demonstrated its opportunities and its possibilities.

Andrew Jackson was not born to the purple; he was no child of pampered fortune; he knew woe and want, poverty and misery, trial and trouble.

He was schooled in the school of adversity, but learned to surmount all difficulties.

He was a soldier in three wars and a hero in each.

His parents came from the north of Ireland. He was of Scotch-Irish origin, and had that blood in his veins with all that it means and all that it implies.

He first saw the light of day in Carolina in March, 1767. It was a new and sparsely settled country. Shortly after his birth his father died, leaving a widow and three orphan children. Andrew Jackson was the youngest.

His early days were days of hardship and privation, but they were trial days to school him and to fit him for the part he was to play in life.

At that time the Revolution smoldered, and when it finally blazed forth in all its fury, the greatest and the grandest Revolution that ever shook the earth, all the Jacksons were in it and a part of it.

Andrew Jackson, then a mere lad, was a soldier and a hero in those dark and stormy days. He was a warrior for the right, a soldier for freedom. He was captured, made a prisoner of war, and while such, because he refused to blacken the boots of an English officer, was struck a cruel blow on the head with a sword. He carried the terrible scar to his grave, but he avenged the insult at New Orleans.

The Revolution passed and the Republic dawned. During the heroic struggle Jackson's mother and his brothers died, all martyrs to the sacred cause. The close of the contest to vindicate the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed found Andrew Jackson homeless, penniless, and friendless, with neither kith nor kin, but nothing daunted. The ordeal of the Revolution made him a man, a patriot, and a Democrat.

Andrew Jackson loved his mother with a passion almost divine. His devotion to her memory is the noblest trait in his heroic character, and his undying fame her greatest monument.

Napoleon asked, "What is wanting to save the youth of France?" Madame Champan answered, "Mothers." No man was ever truly great whose mother was not really great.

Andrew Jackson's mother intended him for the ministry, but fate willed otherwise. He studied law, practiced it successfully, was a judge and a good jurist, a member of both branches of Congress, molded the Constitution of Tennessee, was the greatest and most successful Indian fighter who ever lived, crushed at New Orleans the greatest invading forces which ever desecrated our sacred soil, humbled in the dust the flower of the English army, and destroyed for all time the power and the prestige of Great Britain on the Western Hemisphere.

Andrew Jackson was the hero of the war of 1812 and won its most decisive victory. We celebrate that triumph to-night. He was a great citizen-soldier, but a greater civilian. He was a volunteer and believed in and stood for the volunteer forces of the Republic. He was opposed to a great standing army and had no sympathy with imperialism.

He was a Democrat, reared in the Democratic school of Thomas Jefferson. He stood for the freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, for civil and religious liberty, for the Constitution, for all that Jefferson stood for. He believed in our cardinal principle of special privileges to none, equal opportunities for all.

He stood for advancement, for progress, for personal liberty, for the school-house and the home. There was nothing illiberal, nothing narrow-minded, about Andrew Jackson. He was broad-gauged and broad-minded. He believed in the ability of the plain people to govern themselves. He stood for their rights, their hopes, their aspirations, and he vindicated them while he lived.

He brought about the annexation of the Floridas and was their first American governor. He accomplished what he purposed; he did things.

He was twice President of the United States, stamped his personality indelibly on her history, and when he died he was the popular idol of the American people. He will always be one of the most interesting figures in our history.

He vindicated American institutions, crushed treason, pilloried nullification, and dethroned the United States Bank, the greatest trust and monopoly of his day.

He stood for the home and the hearthside, the sanctity of the family, and for the blessings of Christian civilization.

He stood for internal improvements, for commerce, the American merchant marine, and he loved his country with an intensity that was patriotism personified.

No one ever questioned the purity of his patriotism, or challenges the integrity of his motives, and yet no public man in all our history was ever more bitterly assailed by his enemies or more justly loved by his friends and adherents.

Andrew Jackson had his faults and his foibles. He was not a demigod—he was only human. He hated and he loved in human ways like other human beings. He triumphed and he suffered. He was a man of force and of passion, the man for every crisis, and yet no man could be calmer under more trying circumstances—no man suffered more and complained less. His whole life was an heroic struggle mentally and physically. But amid all the storms of his tempest-tossed career his heart beat true, and was ever warm; his hand was always steady, his head was ever cool, and within his stern exterior there dwelt a Christian spirit and a noble nature as gentle as a woman's. He was a great Democratic leader, and no man ever had more loyal followers.

He stood for the true democracy, the rule of the plain people, the democracy which unfetters trade, fosters commerce, establishes industry, aids enterprise, maintains equal opportunity, unshackles the mind and the conscience, and defends liberty.

He was a great man, the representative of two centuries. He was the embodiment of true American manhood, the personification of the genius of our free institutions, and the incarnation of Jeffersonian Democracy. He always subordinated personal interest to his sense of public duty.

We are Americans, we are Democrats; and as Americans and Democrats we love and revere the memory of Andrew Jackson, the illustrious patriot of the Hermitage, the hero of New Orleans, and the sage of Tennessee.

It is not my purpose to eulogize the hero of New Orleans. Nothing I can
3716

say will add to his greatness or his glory. History has done Andrew Jackson ample justice. His monument, more enduring than marble or brass, is in the grateful and patriotic hearts of his loyal countrymen.

It is fitting and proper, however, that this day should be celebrated by the Democrats of our country and by the plain people, whose friend Andrew Jackson ever was.

To-day we want and the Republic needs men with the indomitable spirit, the magnificent courage, and the patriotic zeal of Andrew Jackson. The preservation of our free institutions and the perpetuity of the Republic would be absolutely safe if we had an Andrew Jackson in every hamlet, every county, and every State of the Union.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the name and fame of the hero of New Orleans, in our fight to reestablish the American merchant marine. Under his Administration our shipping and our commerce flourished as it never did before. During the Democratic days of Jackson nine-tenths of American commerce was carried in American ships, flying the American flag. To-day more than nine-tenths of American commerce is carried in foreign ships flying foreign flags. Republican legislation has driven our flag from the seas, and destroyed our foreign carrying trade. We pay over \$300,000,000 every year to foreign shipowners. Why? Because we have legislated in their interest, and against the true interest of our own people. Because the Republican party has legislated our flag off the seas.

It is the duty of the Democratic party to restore our merchant marine. We must combat the disastrous policy of the Republican party against our merchant marine and repeal its vicious legislation. We must revive our great shipping industries, and thus give employment to thousands of idle men, re-create the American sailor, and ere long again witness the glad some sight of the American flag flying on every sea and kissing the sky in every foreign port. The Democratic party, the party of Andrew Jackson, must and will restore and reestablish the American merchant marine.

To-night as Democrats we invoke the spirit of Andrew Jackson in favor of the volunteer forces of the Republic and against a large standing army in time of peace composed of men who are not taxpayers, but are tax-eaters. Andrew Jackson was a citizen-soldier, and he believed in the citizen-soldiery of the land. As Democrats we should do all in our power to defeat the now avowed project and policy of the Republican party to increase the Regular Army of our country to 100,000 soldiers. We do not need this vast army in time of peace any more than we need a king. We should favor a great navy to protect our coast and our commerce, but we should, if we are true to the people and our principles, vigorously oppose this enormous increase of the Regular Army. A large standing army in a republic is always a menace to civil liberty and free institutions.

To demonstrate this we have only to look to-day to the pitiful condition of France. We have no need of an immense standing army in time of peace. The Regular Army is the most undemocratic institution we have. In time of trouble, in case of war, the Republic should rely on its citizen-soldiery and its volunteer forces. It is contrary to the true principles of the Democratic party to permit the military power to become supreme and paramount to the civil authority. A desperate effort will be made by the Republicans to pass the act to create a great standing army, and if it succeeds it will burden the taxpayers of the country for its maintenance \$150,000,000 a year. Every Democrat in the land should be alive to the dangers of this Republican movement, and do all in his power to frustrate it.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the memory of the hero of New Orleans against any alliance with Great Britain, especially when the agent of that Government is the Benedict Arnold of the home-rule cause. We need no al-

alliance with Great Britain. All we need now, as in the past, is a firm reliance on our own greatness, our own ability, our own integrity, our own power to defend our rights, protect our citizens, and legislate for ourselves on every proposition regarding our own welfare, our own happiness, our own well-being, and our own prosperity.

If Andrew Jackson were alive to-day he would never sanction an alliance with Great Britain. The spirit of 1776 and 1812 still lives. The Republican party is in favor of this alliance: the Democratic party should be strenuously opposed to it. Its consummation means national disintegration.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the memory of President Andrew Jackson against the encroachments on the rights of the people of the national banks. They menace our Republic to-day. Jackson waged the most bitter and relentless war of his life against the United States Bank, and finally destroyed that gigantic monopoly. If he had not it would have destroyed the Republic. One of the greatest acts of his life was the veto of the bill extending the charter of that bank trust. In the light of what is going on to-day that veto message should be read by every citizen in our land. There is a bill now pending in Congress which gives to the national banks of the country far greater powers and privileges than were ever enjoyed by the United States Bank. It is a Republican bill, and the Republican party stands sponsor for it and is committed to its passage.

If it should become a law it would give the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suited their convenience. No corporation should have this power to make or destroy. It would deprive the Government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and give to the national banks the right to paralyze, at their own will, every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the Government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power would be a crime against every citizen in this land and work woe and misery to millions yet unborn.

As a Democrat, and a follower of Andrew Jackson, I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. The Democratic party should vigorously oppose conferring any additional powers on or granting any greater privileges to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing precisely to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly. As Democrats and believers in the meaning of this day, we should resist the encroachments of national banks on the liberties of the people with the same zeal and the same courage that Andrew Jackson resisted the audacious claims of the United States Bank in his day. And when the national banks impudently declare that the Government should go out of the banking business, we should answer that the banks should and must go out of the governing business. And we should make that answer good now and for all time to come.

In Jackson's day there was only one Nick Biddle. To-day there is a Nick Biddle in every national bank in the land.

Let me say here, it is a matter of gratification for me to tell you that the recent attempt of the Republicans to pass through Congress an international bank charter met with the signal and the overwhelming defeat that the scheme deserved. It was one of the most iniquitous bills ever presented to Congress. According to its terms there was no limit to its powers for self

and no end to its possibilities for evil. If it had been enacted into law it would have created the greatest trust the world has ever seen. By virtue of its provisions it would monopolize, own, and control almost everything under the sun. It was the most colossal scheme ever devised by the ingenuity of man to rob and swindle the people and to enslave for all time to come the industrial masses.

Under the provisions of that bill this gigantic financial trust, with unlimited capital, unrestricted powers, and unparalleled opportunities, would soon absorb, monopolize, own, and control the wealth, the treasure, and the commercial and industrial business enterprises of the land. The bill was so cleverly drawn that the men behind it could practically do anything from buying and holding land to loaning money on personal property, and they could do it all on their own terms and fix their own rates of interest. It would have been the trust of trusts. It was the greatest trust franchise Congress was ever asked to give away, and I am happy to state that by a very decisive vote Congress placed its seal of condemnation on the colossal scheme. But it will come up again. The forces of corruption are always active, never conquered. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

As Democrats to-night we should also invoke the patriotic spirit of the great destroyer of the United States Bank monopoly, Andrew Jackson, and, following in his footsteps, every Democrat in our land should enlist in the war of the people against the trusts. Andrew Jackson was the implacable foe of monopoly. Were he alive to-day he would be the implacable foe of the trusts.

To-day the great trusts of the country are practically supreme. Many of them are so intrenched in power that they are to all intents and purposes above the law and no longer amenable to legislative action. The crying evil of the times is the power and the sway of the trusts. They endanger not only our free institutions but our free men. The battle cry of the Democratic party should be. "The trusts must go!"

To-day about 200 trusts control, wholly or in large part, every conceivable product and industry of the country.

These gigantic combinations constitute, in my judgment, the greatest menace at the present time to our democratic institutions. They control the supply, monopolize the product, and dictate the price of every necessary of life. They force out of legitimate employment thousands and thousands of honest toilers. They enhance prices, reduce wages, and write the terms of their own contracts. They destroy competition, paralyze opportunity, assassinate labor, and hold the consumers of our country in their monopolistic grasp. They levy tribute on every man, woman, and child in the Republic. They blight the poor man's home, darken the hearthside of his children, cloud the star of legitimate hope, and destroy equal opportunity. They control legislation, escape taxation, and evade the just burdens of government, while their agents construct and maintain tariffs to suit their selfish ends and greedy purposes. They imperil trade, stagnate industry, regulate foreign and interstate commerce, declare quarterly dividends on watered stocks, and make fortunes every year out of the people. Their tyrannical power, rapid growth, and centralization of wealth are the marvel of recent times and the saddest commentary on our legislative history. Prior to the civil war there was not a trust in the country except the United States Bank trust, which Jackson killed.

They practically own, run, and control the Government to-day, and defy successful prosecution for violation of law. If their power of centralization is not speedily checked, and they go on for another quarter of a century like they have in the past few years, I believe our free institutions will be destroyed, and instead of a Government of the people, by the people, and for

the people, we will have a Government of the trusts, by the trusts, and for the trusts.

How much longer will the people humbly consent to be robbed and submissively permit a continuation of this outrageous policy of favoritism by class legislation? All legislation bestowing special benefits on the few is unjust, and against the masses and for the classes. It has gone on until less than 8 per cent of the people own more than two thirds of all the wealth of our country. It has been truly said that monarchies are destroyed by poverty and republics by wealth. If the greatest republic the world has ever seen is destroyed, it will fall by this vicious system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few.

The total population of the United States is about 70,000,000. The total aggregate wealth of the United States, according to the best statistics that can be procured, is estimated at about \$32,000,000,000, and it appears, and no doubt much to the surprise of many, that out of a total population of 70,000,000 less than 40,000 persons in the United States own more than one-half of the entire aggregate wealth of the land. And this has all been brought about by legislation during the last twenty-five years.

The centralization of wealth in the hands of the few by the robbery of the many during the past quarter of a century has been simply enormous, and the facts and figures are appalling. Three-quarters of the entire wealth of our land appears to be concentrated in the hands of a very small minority of the people, and the number of persons constituting that minority grows smaller every year. The legislative schemes which have been most favored for checking this growing centralization of wealth are generally the most elusive and the most impotent.

Impartial students of these startling facts and statistics can hardly escape the irresistible conclusion that a conspiracy exists, and has existed for some time, to convert the Government of the United States into a powerful oligarchy of wealth. The millionaires, the plutocrats, the trusts, the monopolies, and the syndicates seem to be supreme and legislate for their own interests, benefit, and protection. If it continues, the yeomanry of our country will soon be reduced to a condition of industrial serfdom more pitiable than ever existed before in the history of the world.

The money power, the trusts, the syndicates, and the favored few of the land threaten the perpetuity of our free institutions by subsidizing the pulpit, buying the press, seating well-paid attorneys in legislative halls and courts of justice, stifling free speech and the right of lawful assembly and stretching out their tentacles to the colleges of the land to crush professors who have the courage of their convictions and dare to tell the truth regarding economic and social principles.

My friends, to crush the trusts, now and forever, is the highest duty, and the true mission to-day of the Democratic party. In this war of extermination against the octopus which is enslaving our industrial masses, and destroying our free institutions, we should invoke the aid and the support of every lover of liberty, and every disciple of Andrew Jackson, whose memory we revere and celebrate to-day. He said: "The Union must and shall be preserved." Let us to-night as firmly resolve and proclaim that the rights and the liberties of the people must and shall be preserved from the insidious encroachments of aggregated wealth.

THE UNIVERSAL BENEFIT OF PENSION EXPENDITURES.

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM SULZER OF NEW YORK

In the House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 5, 1900.

The House being in committee of the whole on the State of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy —

Mr. SULZER said :

Mr. Chairman :

* * * * *

On December 14, 1899, the National Tribune said :

THE UNIVERSAL BENEFIT OF PENSION EXPENDITURES.

Few who read and are influenced by the constant tirade against the "burden of pension expenditures" stop to reflect that there is a much greater fact to be offset against this. That is, the incalculable, incomputable, but nevertheless direct and positive, dollars-and-cents value of the periodical disbursements for pensions to the merchants, retail dealers of all kinds, physicians, and professional men, the mechanics and artisans of the whole country. It is they who, in the end, receive the most benefit from pension expenditures. In a very little while every dollar of the \$140,000,000 annually paid out for pensions finds its way into the pockets of men who have stores and shops, large or small, who sell dry goods, clothing, shoes, hats, groceries, meat, family supplies, drugs and medicines, who practice medicine or dentistry, who run blacksmith, carpenter, or other shops, or who are, in short, doing anything useful for the community in which the pensioners live.

Entirely differing from any other class of Government creditors, the pensioners immediately spend every dollar that is paid them directly among their neighbors in the village where they reside. They are the very opposite of the bondholder, who takes his interest to pay the expenses of himself and family in Europe ; or the contractor who locks his gold and greenbacks up in the vaults of a safety deposit company, or some other man who may expend his check on the subtreasury in silks and diamonds and French wines. The pensioner's dollars are all for the prime necessities of life, such as his neighbors around him make their living by supplying.

The direct benefit of this to the business men and artisans of every village and town in the country is simply beyond computation or expressing. It is a mighty power to keep money in healthful circulation and promote general prosperity. Capitalists may get frightened, clutch all the money in reach and lock it up in vaults ; bankers may put the screws on "accommodations ;" operators may plot to tighten the money

market; strikes may occur to stop work and wages; mills may shut down; crops may fail; grasshoppers devour; flood waste and hurricanes devastate, but so long as pensions are paid there will be some ready money coming into town every three months, upon which business can be done. There will be money in circulation which will be independent alike of the manipulations of selfish financiers and the misfortunes to trades and agriculture.

Take, for example, the State of Ohio. There are 105,627 pensioners in the State, who receive every year \$15,456,006.90. As there are 88 counties in the State, this would make an average of 1,200 pensioners to each county and an average payment to each county of \$175,636. That is, the Treasury distributes among the people of each county in Ohio an average of \$43,906 every three months.

Can there be any overestimation of the benefits which flow to every merchant, every shopkeeper, every retail dealer, every mechanic, every artisan, of the quarterly payment of this great sum directly to the people of the county? There is not a man in the whole county, no matter what he does or what business he is engaged in, but within a very short time after pension day gets some of this money in his pocket. Even if he is only a day laborer he finds some one ready to hire him and pay him good wages than he would be were it not for this.

And the certainty that this money will come—that it can not be prevented by Wall street panics, or bankers' schemes, or trade disturbances, or crop failures, enables men of all kinds to go ahead and make their arrangements with a degree of confidence which they otherwise would not have. From the quickness with which this money passes into circulation and from hand to hand among all classes it does more good than millions would if doled out through the timid and stringent methods of the banks.

Then there is the question "of the burden on the taxpayer." No matter what he may say for the purposes of argument, every decently informed man knows that the fund from which pensions are paid is not the slightest burden on any taxpayer. As a rule, the customs duties and internal-revenue duties were imposed and are maintained more for the protection of American industry, and the regulation of certain traffics, than to secure the revenue. Take, for example, oleomargarine, from which the Government receives about \$2,000,000 a year. This tax was levied to restrain the production and sale of bogus butter and cheese, and the revenue part was a mere fiction. Before the war with Spain called for extraordinary expenditures, the Government had to find a way to return to the people the money it was obliged to collect to protect American manufacturers and to regulate the whisky, beer, and tobacco trades. The people demanded that certain duties be imposed on imported goods and on the distillation and sale of whisky, the brewing and sale of beer, and the manufacture and sale of bogus butter and cheese. What was done with the proceeds of those duties was a secondary question. The imposition of the duties was the main thing and in this they were resolute. The expenses of the Spanish war are now being rapidly met, and we shall soon return to the same condition. "The burden on the taxpayer" is the most absurd of partisan fictions.

In paying pensions the Government is not only meeting its just obligations to those whom it is overwhelmingly indebted, but incidentally it has hit upon the most effective way in which to return to the whole people, without partiality or favoritism, the money it is compelled by a mandate of the people to collect for economic and moral purposes.

INTERNATIONAL BANKING BILL.

"While I am a Member of Congress I will do all in my power to defeat legislation in the interest of the trusts and for the benefit of the monopolies."

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1898.

WASHINGTON.

1898.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 10807) to carry into effect the recommendations of the International American Conference by the incorporation of the international American bank—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: This measure should be entitled "A bill to create the international bank trust." That is just what it does, and it would be the greatest trust the world has ever seen. In less than five years, if this bill becomes a law, it will own and control all the other trusts in this country and every other country where it can secure a foothold.

In my judgment this is one of the most iniquitous bills ever presented to Congress. It seeks to create, and does create, the greatest and most gigantic trust ever conceived by the ingenuity of the human mind; a trust that would for all practical purposes own, control, and monopolize almost everything under the sun. According to the terms of this charter there is no limit to its powers and no end to its possibilities for evil when manipulated by clever and unscrupulous men.

The advocates of this bill would have us believe it is a simple measure and clothes the company with no far-reaching and unusual powers. This is not so. Under the provisions of this bill there is hardly a conceivable thing this trust could not do. Read it, and I believe you will agree with me. It legislates away, in my opinion, the most sweeping franchise I have ever read.

It seems almost incredible that the daring and farseeing manipulators behind this colossal scheme, devised for the purpose of swindling the people, could ever hope to successfully pass it. It must be clear to all that it ought not to pass. It never should have been reported. It ought to be, and it will be if we do our duty, the worst beaten bill in this Congress.

During the debate this morning I have carefully listened to all that has been said for and against this bill, and, sir, I have yet to hear one good reason why this bill should become a law. The arguments of those who favor this bill show, if they show anything, that sweeping legislation of this character is unwise and a step in the wrong direction. There is no good reason why we should give away to a banking trust such unusual powers. If we do, I believe it will open the door to a continuance of abuses which will never end and to the possibilities for evil beyond the calculation of the human intellect. All legislation giving additional advantages to corporations and trusts is a direct blow at the rights of the people. These combinations of capital already enjoy too much favor at the hands of the law.

I have carefully read this bill and the report of the committee. The report, so far as I can see, fails to give a single reason why this bill should meet with the approval of the members of this House.

The most cursory examination of the provisions of this bill will demonstrate to the most thoughtless man in the House that the bill is radically wrong and inherently bad. It is essentially a piece of legal favoritism. It takes from the many for the benefit of the few. It is monopoly pure and simple, and in its meanest form. It is class legislation of the worst type. Its sweeping provisions constitute a mighty stride in the wrong direction. It fashions a mighty trust, and places it on a pedestal beyond the law. I am against this kind of legislation, and I will always do all in my power to defeat it. All legislation of this special and exclusive character is absolutely wrong. The saddest comment on our legislative history is the just criticism that there has been too much special legislation for the past thirty years. I view this kind of special legislation with alarm, and sound a note of warning against it. We all know what it has done, what it is doing, and what it will continue to do. The history of the past teaches, if it teaches anything, that it quickly becomes an instrument for the robbing of the people for the benefit of the trusts—a legalized tyranny to oppress the people for the advantage of greedy corporate interests.

The bill confers unheard-of powers on a few individuals, who

will be able to make wealth beyond the dreams of avarice by the operation of its provisions. We should not legislate to create for a few advantages denied to the many. All legislation, so far as possible, should be general, not special. In my opinion, more injury has been done the people of this country by corrupt special legislation than by any other single agency. In nearly every instance the great fortunes of our millionaires and multimillionaires are the simple results of this obnoxious special legislation.

This bill will create the greatest financial trust of the century. No doubt nine-tenths of the members of this House, if asked, would say they were against the trusts, and yet I fear many of these same members will vote for this bill and do all they can to enact it into law.

Let me say to the members of this House that I am unalterably opposed to trusts. I am opposed to all the trusts, each and every one, now in existence, and to all and any legislation seeking to create new and more trusts.

I am opposed to the Government delegating away the rights of the people to a few individuals associated together for the purpose of making money under the title of the "International Bank." Ever since the civil war the Government has been delegating away its powers to selfish and soulless corporations. We should not delegate to corporations the powers vested in the Government by the people. If we do, the corporations and the trusts will soon become greater and more powerful than the Government.

Under the provisions of this bill this gigantic financial trust, with unlimited capital, unrestricted powers, and unparalleled opportunities, would soon absorb and ere long control the financial and commercial business of the whole country. It could do anything that can be done to-day by any copartnership, trust, monopoly, or corporation in this country or in any other country where it could get a foothold. It could absorb the wealth, the treasure, and the business of the land, and do it on its own terms. It would become the trust of trusts, and by its charter do a general pawn-brokerage business and fix its own rates of interest. In fact, it could do anything from buying a farm to loaning money on a watch.

For the Government to give away a great franchise like this

will be an irreparable wrong to the people of this country. This is the greatest franchise, in the opinion of many, ever devised and that Congress ever attempted to give away.

This bill creating this financial trust is the greatest scheme ever invented by man to oppress and enslave his fellow-man. No doubt the true design of the men behind this great corporation is to get this franchise to organize a tremendous banking and pawnbrokerage trust, with all the powers and privileges of a national bank except the privilege of issuing money, and finally to relieve the Government of that attribute of sovereignty, and do it all without governmental control or supervision.

What a spectacle of legislative audacity this unrivaled proposition presents! It could never originate on this side of the House. Read the legislative history of our country and you will find that all legislation similar in character and purposes to this is the handiwork of the Republican party. It can not be successfully controverted that the policies and principles of the Republican party create and foster trusts and monopolies.

The Democratic party is opposed to special legislation, and is the natural foe and the unswerving enemy of trusts. By virtue of its principles and through the instrumentality of its policies they can be crushed, and they will be crushed and destroyed.

The Congress of the United States should legislate, not for the trusts, but against them; not for the few, but for the many. We do entirely too much for special interests, not enough for the general welfare of all the people of our land. The crying evil of our times is special legislation which robs the many for the benefit of the few, and does it all under the guise of law. I am opposed to all special legislation of this character. I stand for equal rights to all, special privileges to none. I hope the day is not far distant when a Democratic Congress will pass a law making it impossible for a trust or a monopoly to exist in this country.

I am opposed to this bill because I believe it will create the greatest monopoly and the most gigantic trust in the world. While I am a member of Congress I will do all in my power to defeat legislation in the interest of the trusts and for the benefit of the monopolies. This bill should challenge the honest criticism of every man in our country. Its passage would be an outrage

on every taxpayer and an insult to every honest toiler. I can not believe it has any chance to become a law now, but the very attempt to pass it should arrest the attention of every patriot in the land and put the thinking citizens of our country on their guard. Ere long, I doubt not, another effort will be made. The representatives of the trusts are most tenacious and ever active and watchful. The representatives of the people must be so, too, or our free institutions will be doomed.

Mr. Speaker, for the past thirty years the Congress of the United States has been delegating to trusts and monopolies vast powers and privileges. All of this legislation has been against the rights of the people and for the benefit of a few individuals who have been made millionaires and multimillionaires by operation of law. The future historian of our country, viewing with an impartial eye this period of law-made wealth in our wonderful history, will call this legislative epoch the "crime of the century," and its pernicious results will affect generations yet unborn and blight the opportunities of millions yet to come.

These great trusts and monopolies are springing up every day, and they flourish like the green bay tree. Many of them are so intrenched in power that they are to all intents and purposes above law and no longer amenable to legislative action. They limit the supply of the product which they control, and force out of employment thousands and thousands of honest toilers. They enhance prices, lower wages, and write the terms of their own contracts. They destroy all competition, and have every consumer in the country in their power. You must pay their price or do without. Every man, woman, and child in all our land, every home, and every hearth side must pay tribute to the trusts. This is the ransom the trusts exact for the people's right to live. Legislation has done all this; legislation can remedy it all.

To-day about 200 trusts control, wholly or in large part, every conceivable product and industry of the country. These combines dictate the supply and manipulate the price. They control legislation, national, State, and municipal. They escape taxes and construct and maintain tariffs to suit their own selfish ends. They regulate foreign and interstate commerce, declare quarterly dividends on watered stock, and make fortunes every year out of

the people. From the Standard Oil trust down they are all the same, all doing business on the same line, all robbing the many for the benefit of the few. And the many submit to it. Why? I know not. The people can, if they determine to, settle this question in one election and crush forever out of existence every trust in the land.

Why is it people seldom rebel against being robbed indirectly by operation of law? However, I believe the trusts can not permanently exist in the United States if the people once become alive to the great injustice done them by these combinations of capital. To think otherwise would be a bitter commentary on our intelligence in the last decade of the dying nineteenth century.

The power of the trusts has been a thing of rapid growth and of recent times. Prior to the civil war there was not a trust in this country.

The Republican party is responsible for the trusts and stands sponsor for them to-day. The only hope of the people is in the Democratic party and through its representatives.

The Democratic party must make the destruction of the trusts and the monopolies one of its leading issues in the next campaign. If the trusts now practically own and run the Government and their insatiable greed and power are not soon checked, another quarter of a century will witness free institutions subverted, the Constitution dethroned, industrial slavery the corner stone of the Government, and an obligarchy of wealth sitting in high places and the rulers of the land.

These gigantic trusts, in my judgment, constitute a greater menace to our Government and our free institutions than anything else. I would like to see every chamber of commerce, every board of trade, every labor organization, every business man, and every taxpayer take up this fight against the trusts and carry it on to the end. It is a cause worthy of every honest and sincere man; and if they will enlist, the war against the trusts will soon be over, the monopolies of the land destroyed, and the country saved.

Mr. Speaker, I notice my time is nearly exhausted. Let me say to the members of this House that this bill is the worst trust bill which has ever come to my notice since I have been a servant of

the people. I hope every Democrat will vote against it. It is the greatest trust franchise Congress has ever been asked to give away. If it were enacted into law it would soon become the most tremendous instrument of oppression ever invented by the cruel ingenuity of man to rob and oppress and enslave his fellow-man. Its overwhelming defeat to-day will mark a red-letter day in our legislative history. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

[Extract from Congressional Record, February 7, 1899.]

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

ON "THE DAY WE CELEBRATE,"

BEFORE THE

JACKSON CLUB, OF OMAHA, NEBR.,

Saturday Evening, January 7, 1899.

[Reprinted from the Omaha World-Herald, January 8, 1899.]

WASHINGTON.
1899.

"The Day We Celebrate."

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

[From the *Omaha World-Herald*, January 8, 1899.]

Congressman WILLIAM SULZER spoke as follows:

Mr. President and Gentleman: It is a matter of much personal gratification to me to be with you to-night and participate in your joyous and magnificent celebration of Jackson's day.

I would be false to myself and to every sentiment of gratitude I possess and hold dear if I did not at the very beginning of my remarks express to you how deeply and sincerely I appreciate the honor and the distinguished compliment of your invitation. I accepted it, of course. I could not do otherwise. Coming from whence it did, and how it did, I could not refuse. I am very glad, indeed, to be with you, and as long as I live I shall never forget your courtesy, your reception, your consideration, and your hearty and genuine hospitality.

I like the Democrats of the great West, and I hope they will like me.

I stand squarely on the Chicago platform, and as a Democrat, tried and true to every tenet of our party and to its fundamental principles, I come to you from the toiling, throbbing, earnest Democrats of the East, and bring you their fraternal greeting, and their message of hope for union and harmony in our ranks, and for the triumphant victory of our grand old party for years to come.

In my judgment, we are destined to triumph if we religiously adhere to our principles, fearlessly and vigorously promulgate them, and honestly and tenaciously strive to enforce them. We must be true to ourselves and to the teachings of the fathers of Democracy, and if we are and continue to have faith in the justice of our cause, we must and will succeed, and signal victory must and will crown our efforts.

We celebrate to-day one of the most important epochs in the annals of our history.

This is Andrew Jackson's day, sacred to the memory of the hero of New Orleans, sacred to the memory of the grand old man, the old hickory of the Democratic party, sacred to the memory of one of the most unique, one of the most stalwart, and one of the most magnificent figures and characters in all American history.

Andrew Jackson was a hero from his cradle to his grave. Irresistible events and circumstances beyond his control made him so.

The fascinating story of his life reads like a romance and demonstrates that truth is stranger than fiction. That story is a part of the most stirring and eventful period in our history, an incentive to every hopeful schoolboy, a beacon to every sincere patriot, a star of hope to every struggling toiler, and a conclusive proof of the stability and the opportunity of democratic institutions.

Andrew Jackson from his birth to his bier was a remarkable personage. He was a man of iron will and of indomitable spirit. His veins were filled with good red blood, but his nerves were of steel. He never knew fear. He never turned his back on friend or foe. He knew the right and never hesitated to do it. He hated cant, despised hypocrisy, and cared naught for consequences.

He was a plain man. He loved the plain people; they understood him and they loved him.

He was a forceful man, a direct man, a positive man, an honest man, and a truthful man. He hated a liar, and he spurned with contempt a coward.

His life began with the struggles of a brave people to cast off the tyrannous yoke of oppression, and when it went out his last look witnessed the greatest and the grandest Republic the world has ever seen.

His life was a part of the Republic, and demonstrated its opportunities and its possibilities.

Andrew Jackson was not born to the purple; he was no child of pampered fortune; he knew woe and want, poverty and misery, trial and trouble.

He was schooled in the school of adversity, but learned to surmount all difficulties.

He was a soldier in three wars and a hero in each.

His parents came from the north of Ireland. He was of Scotch-Irish origin, and had that blood in his veins with all that it means and all that it implies.

He first saw the light of day in Carolina in March, 1767. It was a new and sparsely settled country. Shortly after his birth his father died, leaving a widow and three orphan children. Andrew Jackson was the youngest.

His early days were days of hardship and privation, but they were trial days to school him and to fit him for the part he was to play in life.

At that time the Revolution smoldered, and when it finally blazed forth in all its fury, the greatest and the grandest Revolution that ever shook the earth, all the Jacksons were in it and a part of it.

Andrew Jackson, then a mere lad, was a soldier and a hero in those dark and stormy days. He was a warrior for the right, a soldier for freedom. He was captured, made a prisoner of war, and while such, because he refused to blacken the boots of an English officer, was struck a cruel blow on the head with a sword. He carried the terrible scar to his grave, but he avenged the insult at New Orleans.

The Revolution passed and the Republic dawned. During the heroic struggle Jackson's mother and his brothers died, all martyrs to the sacred cause. The close of the contest to vindicate the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed found Andrew Jackson homeless, penniless, and friendless, with neither kith nor kin, but nothing daunted. The ordeal of the Revolution made him a man, a patriot, and a Democrat.

Andrew Jackson loved his mother with a passion almost divine. His devotion to her memory is the noblest trait in his heroic character, and his undying fame her greatest monument.

Napoleon asked, "What is wanting to save the youth of France?" Madame Champau answered, "Mothers." No man was ever truly great whose mother was not really great.

Andrew Jackson's mother intended him for the ministry, but fate willed otherwise. He studied law, practiced it successfully, was a judge and a good jurist, a member of both branches of Congress, molded the Constitution of Tennessee, was the greatest and most successful Indian fighter who ever lived, crushed at New Orleans the greatest invading forces which ever desecrated our sacred soil, humbled in the dust the flower of the English army, and destroyed for all time the power and the prestige of Great Britain on the Western Hemisphere.

Andrew Jackson was the hero of the war of 1812 and won its most decisive victory. We celebrate that triumph to-night. He was a great citizen-soldier, but a greater civilian. He was a volunteer and believed in and stood for the volunteer forces of the Republic. He was opposed to a great standing army and had no sympathy with imperialism.

He was a Democrat, reared in the Democratic school of Thomas Jefferson. He stood for the freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, for civil and religious liberty, for the Constitution, for all that Jefferson stood for. He believed in our cardinal principle of special privileges to none, equal opportunities for all.

He stood for advancement, for progress, for personal liberty, for the school-house and the home. There was nothing illiberal, nothing narrow-minded, about Andrew Jackson. He was broad-gauged and broad-minded. He believed in the ability of the plain people to govern themselves. He stood for their rights, their hopes, their aspirations, and he vindicated them while he lived.

He brought about the annexation of the Floridas and was their first American governor. He accomplished what he purposed; he did things.

He was twice President of the United States, stamped his personality indelibly on her history, and when he died he was the popular idol of the American people. He will always be one of the most interesting figures in our history.

He vindicated American institutions, crushed treason, pilloried nullification, and dethroned the United States Bank, the greatest trust and monopoly of his day.

He stood for the home and the hearthside, the sanctity of the family, and for the blessings of Christian civilization.

He stood for internal improvements, for commerce, the American merchant marine, and he loved his country with an intensity that was patriotism personified.

No one ever questioned the purity of his patriotism, or challenges the integrity of his motives, and yet no public man in all our history was ever more bitterly assailed by his enemies or more justly loved by his friends and adherents.

Andrew Jackson had his faults and his foibles. He was not a demigod—he was only human. He hated and he loved in human ways like other human beings. He triumphed and he suffered. He was a man of force and of passion, the man for every crisis, and yet no man could be calmer under more trying circumstances—no man suffered more and complained less. His whole life was an heroic struggle mentally and physically. But amid all the storms of his tempest-tossed career his heart beat true, and was ever warm; his hand was always steady, his head was ever cool, and within his stern exterior there dwelt a Christian spirit and a noble nature as gentle as a woman's. He was a great Democratic leader, and no man ever had more loyal followers.

He stood for the true democracy, the rule of the plain people, the democracy which unfetters trade, fosters commerce, establishes industry, aids enterprise, maintains equal opportunity, unshackles the mind and the conscience, and defends liberty.

He was a great man, the representative of two centuries. He was the embodiment of true American manhood, the personification of the genius of our free institutions, and the incarnation of Jeffersonian Democracy. He always subordinated personal interest to his sense of public duty.

We are Americans, we are Democrats; and as Americans and Democrats we love and revere the memory of Andrew Jackson, the illustrious patriot of the Hermitage, the hero of New Orleans, and the sage of Tennessee.

It is not my purpose to eulogize the hero of New Orleans. Nothing I can
3718

say will add to his greatness or his glory. History has done Andrew Jackson ample justice. His monument, more enduring than marble or brass, is in the grateful and patriotic hearts of his loyal countrymen.

It is fitting and proper, however, that this day should be celebrated by the Democrats of our country and by the plain people, whose friend Andrew Jackson ever was.

To-day we want and the Republic needs men with the indomitable spirit, the magnificent courage, and the patriotic zeal of Andrew Jackson. The preservation of our free institutions and the perpetuity of the Republic would be absolutely safe if we had an Andrew Jackson in every hamlet, every county, and every State of the Union.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the name and fame of the hero of New Orleans, in our fight to reestablish the American merchant marine. Under his Administration our shipping and our commerce flourished as it never did before. During the Democratic days of Jackson nine-tenths of American commerce was carried in American ships, flying the American flag. To-day more than nine-tenths of American commerce is carried in foreign ships flying foreign flags. Republican legislation has driven our flag from the seas, and destroyed our foreign carrying trade. We pay over \$300,000,000 every year to foreign shipowners. Why? Because we have legislated in their interest, and against the true interest of our own people. Because the Republican party has legislated our flag off the seas.

It is the duty of the Democratic party to restore our merchant marine. We must combat the disastrous policy of the Republican party against our merchant marine and repeal its vicious legislation. We must revive our great shipping industries, and thus give employment to thousands of idle men, re-create the American sailor, and ere long again witness the glad sight of the American flag flying on every sea and kissing the sky in every foreign port. The Democratic party, the party of Andrew Jackson, must and will restore and reestablish the American merchant marine.

To-night as Democrats we invoke the spirit of Andrew Jackson in favor of the volunteer forces of the Republic and against a large standing army in time of peace composed of men who are not taxpayers, but are tax-eaters. Andrew Jackson was a citizen-soldier, and he believed in the citizen-soldiery of the land. As Democrats we should do all in our power to defeat the now avowed project and policy of the Republican party to increase the Regular Army of our country to 100,000 soldiers. We do not need this vast army in time of peace any more than we need a king. We should favor a great navy to protect our coast and our commerce, but we should, if we are true to the people and our principles, vigorously oppose this enormous increase of the Regular Army. A large standing army in a republic is always a menace to civil liberty and free institutions.

To demonstrate this we have only to look to-day to the pitiful condition of France. We have no need of an immense standing army in time of peace. The Regular Army is the most undemocratic institution we have. In time of trouble, in case of war, the Republic should rely on its citizen-soldiery and its volunteer forces. It is contrary to the true principles of the Democratic party to permit the military power to become supreme and paramount to the civil authority. A desperate effort will be made by the Republicans to pass the act to create a great standing army, and if it succeeds it will burden the taxpayers of the country for its maintenance \$150,000,000 a year. Every Democrat in the land should be alive to the dangers of this Republican movement, and do all in his power to frustrate it.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the memory of the hero of New Orleans against any alliance with Great Britain, especially when the agent of that Government is the Benedict Arnold of the home-rule cause. We need no al-

liance with Great Britain. All we need now, as in the past, is a firm reliance on our own greatness, our own ability, our own integrity, our own power to defend our rights, protect our citizens, and legislate for ourselves on every proposition regarding our own welfare, our own happiness, our own well-being, and our own prosperity.

If Andrew Jackson were alive to-day he would never sanction an alliance with Great Britain. The spirit of 1776 and 1812 still lives. The Republican party is in favor of this alliance: the Democratic party should be strenuously opposed to it. Its consummation means national disintegration.

To-night, as Democrats, we invoke the memory of President Andrew Jackson against the encroachments on the rights of the people of the national banks. They menace our Republic to-day. Jackson waged the most bitter and relentless war of his life against the United States Bank, and finally destroyed that gigantic monopoly. If he had not it would have destroyed the Republic. One of the greatest acts of his life was the veto of the bill extending the charter of that bank trust. In the light of what is going on to-day that veto message should be read by every citizen in our land. There is a bill now pending in Congress which gives to the national banks of the country far greater powers and privileges than were ever enjoyed by the United States Bank. It is a Republican bill, and the Republican party stands sponsor for it and is committed to its passage.

If it should become a law it would give the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suited their convenience. No corporation should have this power to make or destroy. It would deprive the Government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and give to the national banks the right to paralyze, at their own will, every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the Government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power would be a crime against every citizen in this land and work woe and misery to millions yet unborn.

As a Democrat, and a follower of Andrew Jackson, I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. The Democratic party should vigorously oppose conferring any additional powers on or granting any greater privileges to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing precisely to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly. As Democrats and believers in the meaning of this day, we should resist the encroachments of national banks on the liberties of the people with the same zeal and the same courage that Andrew Jackson resisted the audacious claims of the United States Bank in his day. And when the national banks impudently declare that the Government should go out of the banking business, we should answer that the banks should and must go out of the governing business. And we should make that answer good now and for all time to come.

In Jackson's day there was only one Nick Biddle. To-day there is a Nick Biddle in every national bank in the land.

Let me say here, it is a matter of gratification for me to tell you that the recent attempt of the Republicans to pass through Congress an international bank charter met with the signal and the overwhelming defeat that the scheme deserved. It was one of the most iniquitous bills ever presented to Congress. According to its terms there was no limit to its powers for self

and no end to its possibilities for evil. If it had been enacted into law it would have created the greatest trust the world has ever seen. By virtue of its provisions it would monopolize, own, and control almost everything under the sun. It was the most colossal scheme ever devised by the ingenuity of man to rob and swindle the people and to enslave for all time to come the industrial masses.

Under the provisions of that bill this gigantic financial trust, with unlimited capital, unrestricted powers, and unparalleled opportunities, would soon absorb, monopolize, own, and control the wealth, the treasure, and the commercial and industrial business enterprises of the land. The bill was so cleverly drawn that the men behind it could practically do anything from buying and holding land to loaning money on personal property, and they could do it all on their own terms and fix their own rates of interest. It would have been the trust of trusts. It was the greatest trust franchise Congress was ever asked to give away, and I am happy to state that by a very decisive vote Congress placed its seal of condemnation on the colossal scheme. But it will come up again. The forces of corruption are always active, never conquered. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

As Democrats to-night we should also invoke the patriotic spirit of the great destroyer of the United States Bank monopoly, Andrew Jackson, and, following in his footsteps, every Democrat in our land should enlist in the war of the people against the trusts. Andrew Jackson was the implacable foe of monopoly. Were he alive to-day he would be the implacable foe of the trusts.

To-day the great trusts of the country are practically supreme. Many of them are so intrenched in power that they are to all intents and purposes above the law and no longer amenable to legislative action. The crying evil of the times is the power and the sway of the trusts. They endanger not only our free institutions but our free men. The battle cry of the Democratic party should be, "The trusts must go!"

To-day about 200 trusts control, wholly or in large part, every conceivable product and industry of the country.

These gigantic combinations constitute, in my judgment, the greatest menace at the present time to our democratic institutions. They control the supply, monopolize the product, and dictate the price of every necessary of life. They force out of legitimate employment thousands and thousands of honest toilers. They enhance prices, reduce wages, and write the terms of their own contracts. They destroy competition, paralyze opportunity, assassinate labor, and hold the consumers of our country in their monopolistic grasp. They levy tribute on every man, woman, and child in the Republic. They blight the poor man's home, darken the hearthside of his children, cloud the star of legitimate hope, and destroy equal opportunity. They control legislation, escape taxation, and evade the just burdens of government, while their agents construct and maintain tariffs to suit their selfish ends and greedy purposes. They imperil trade, stagnate industry, regulate foreign and interstate commerce, declare quarterly dividends on watered stocks, and make fortunes every year out of the people. Their tyrannical power, rapid growth, and centralization of wealth are the marvel of recent times and the saddest commentary on our legislative history. Prior to the civil war there was not a trust in the country except the United States Bank trust, which Jackson killed.

They practically own, run, and control the Government to-day, and defy successful prosecution for violation of law. If their power of centralization is not speedily checked, and they go on for another quarter of a century like they have in the past few years, I believe our free institutions will be destroyed, and instead of a Government of the people, by the people, and for

the people; we will have a Government of the trusts, by the trusts, and for the trusts.

How much longer will the people humbly consent to be robbed and submissively permit a continuation of this outrageous policy of favoritism by class legislation? All legislation bestowing special benefits on the few is unjust, and against the masses and for the classes. It has gone on until less than 8 per cent of the people own more than two thirds of all the wealth of our country. It has been truly said that monarchies are destroyed by poverty and republics by wealth. If the greatest republic the world has ever seen is destroyed, it will fall by this vicious system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few.

The total population of the United States is about 70,000,000. The total aggregate wealth of the United States, according to the best statistics that can be procured, is estimated at about \$62,000,000,000, and it appears, and no doubt much to the surprise of many, that out of a total population of 70,000,000 less than 40,000 persons in the United States own more than one-half of the entire aggregate wealth of the land. And this has all been brought about by legislation during the last twenty-five years.

The centralization of wealth in the hands of the few by the robbery of the many during the past quarter of a century has been simply enormous, and the facts and figures are appalling. Three-quarters of the entire wealth of our land appears to be concentrated in the hands of a very small minority of the people, and the number of persons constituting that minority grows smaller every year. The legislative schemes which have been most favored for checking this growing centralization of wealth are generally the most elusive and the most impotent.

Impartial students of these startling facts and statistics can hardly escape the irresistible conclusion that a conspiracy exists, and has existed for some time, to convert the Government of the United States into a powerful oligarchy of wealth. The millionaires, the plutocrats, the trusts, the monopolies, and the syndicates seem to be supreme and legislate for their own interests, benefit, and protection. If it continues, the yeomanry of our country will soon be reduced to a condition of industrial serfdom more pitiable than ever existed before in the history of the world.

The money power, the trusts, the syndicates, and the favored few of the land threaten the perpetuity of our free institutions by subsidizing the pulpit, buying the press, seating well-paid attorneys in legislative halls and courts of justice, stifling free speech and the right of lawful assembly and stretching out their tentacles to the colleges of the land to crush professors who have the courage of their convictions and dare to tell the truth regarding economic and social principles.

My friends, to crush the trusts, now and forever, is the highest duty, and the true mission to-day of the Democratic party. In this war of extermination against the octopus which is enslaving our industrial masses, and destroying our free institutions, we should invoke the aid and the support of every lover of liberty, and every disciple of Andrew Jackson, whose memory we revere and celebrate to-day. He said: "The Union must and shall be preserved." Let us to-night as firmly resolve and proclaim that the rights and the liberties of the people must and shall be preserved from the insidious encroachments of aggregated wealth.

NAVAL BILL—ARMY BILLS—GENERAL WHEELER—TRAINED
NURSES—REVOLUTIONARY HEROES—NICARAGUA
CANAL—PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION—
NELSON DINGLEY.

SPEECHES

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

THIRD SESSION, FIFTY-FIFTH CONGRESS.

WASHINGTON.

1899.

SPEECHES
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Friday, February 17, 1899.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12122) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Without regard especially to the point of order now under consideration, I rise for the purpose of saying to the members of this House and to the people of the country generally that I am in favor of this naval appropriation bill, shall vote for it, and so long as I am in Congress I will do everything in my power to maintain, improve, and increase the American Navy.

The American people take a just pride in their Navy. They have every reason to be proud of it, to be proud of its past, to be proud of it now, and to be proud of its future. The Navy is one of America's greatest institutions—a bulwark of defense, a mighty engine of offense—and should be liberally supported by the Congress of the United States for all its wants by generous appropriations.

Every dollar spent on the Navy is just so much money expended for insurance. A better investment could not be made. We must all stand by and for the Navy.

The most unthinking individual in the country realizes how important it is for the Government to have a strong, a great, and a mighty navy. We have a larger and more vulnerable seaboard than any other country in the world. We will soon, I believe, have a great merchant marine. We have great cities of immense wealth, of costly building, of commerce, and of property, the value of which is incalculable, all along our seacoasts. They must and should be all protected, and they can not be better protected, better safeguarded than by a modern, a commensurate, a powerful, and an efficient navy. In my judgment I believe that seven-tenths of the people of this country are more in favor of liberally appropriating money for the Navy than they are for the Army. I say this deliberately, and I am on the Military Affairs Committee. We do not want a large standing army in time of peace.

This naval appropriation bill is an honest and an economical one. It should pass the House unanimously. It only carries an appropriation of about \$45,000,000, while the Army appropriation bill carries appropriations aggregating nearly \$80,000,000, nearly double the amount of the naval bill. We want a mighty navy all the time. It is essential to our safety as a nation and to our supremacy on the high seas. A large standing army in time of peace is,

however, contrary to the spirit of democracy and a menace to free and popular institutions.

In a Republic like ours, based on the consent of the governed, where every man is a part of the Government, where every man stands for the Government, and where every man is, or ought to be, a patriot, we do not need a great standing army in time of peace. We should rely on the volunteers and keep alive the martial spirit of our people.

In time of war every able-bodied man in this country is or should be a soldier of the Republic and bear arms, if necessary, for its defense, for its flag, and for its vindication. We need, however, a great navy for the protection, for the safety, and for the integrity of our great seaboard and our seacoast towns on the Atlantic Ocean, on the Pacific Ocean, and on the Gulf of Mexico. We need a great navy to protect our commerce on the high seas and to vindicate American citizenship and all that it stands for in every port and in every land in the world. I believe in the Navy. I stand for the Navy, and while I am in Congress I will always do all that I can for the Navy—for the men on deck, for the men below, and for the men behind the guns. All honor and all glory to the American sailors, to the American Navy, and to their patriotic, their heroic, and their splendid achievements.

I think I but voice the sentiments of the great majority of the people of this country when I say to you with all candor that we should have a great navy, the equal, in fact, of any in the world. Nothing would be more conducive to lasting peace, permanent security, and continued prosperity.

The recent war between Spain and this country demonstrated the power, the glory, and the effectiveness of the American Navy. Where would we have been in that combat if it had not been for our Navy? It was the Navy that lowered and humbled in the dust the proud banner of Spain in the Orient by the matchless genius and the thundering guns of Dewey. It was the Navy that dethroned the haughty power of Spain on the Western Hemisphere under the great Commander Schley. It was the Navy—our Navy, the Navy of the Republic—that forced the proud and puffed-up Spaniards, who had derided and ridiculed us for years, to hastily sue for peace when Schley's unerring guns sunk the Spanish fleet.

It was the Navy that vindicated the greatness, the glory, and the power of the United States of America and placed us in the front rank of the great powers of the world. It was the Navy that settled the controversy and won the war. Without the Navy we would have been impotent and powerless.

I am glad of this opportunity to speak for the Navy and to speak for the men in the Navy, from the lowest in the ranks to the highest in command. They all did and they all do their duty. They are all heroes, each and every one.

Sir, I would vote for this bill if it appropriated more money than it does. There has been no fraud in the Navy, no stealing, no hypocrisy, no slander, no corruption. Its proud banner is spotless, and history will give it its full measure of praise and glory.

For all that our Navy has recently done and for all that it is to-day we owe much—more than words can tell—to the distinguished chairman of the Naval Committee [Mr. BOUTELLE], to his patriotic colleagues on that committee, especially to my friend and colleague from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS], and to the recent Secretaries of the Navy, among whom should be particularly men-

tioned Secretary Chandler, Secretary Whitney, Secretary Tracy, Secretary Herbert, and the present efficient and distinguished Secretary, Mr. Long. The country owes them a debt of gratitude it can never pay. The great work they have done for the Navy and for the Republic can hardly be estimated, and I doubt not will never be really and truly appreciated. All honor to them, I say. Their best reward, however, is in the consciousness of duty well done for duty's sake. As the years come and go let us indulge the hope that their work will be more and better understood, and their patriotic efforts duly recognized and sincerely applauded.

We are a mighty people. We have a great and a superb country. We are the great, the peerless Republic. We have an immense seaboard. We must build up a great merchant marine; we must build and own the Nicaragua Canal, and we want a great navy to promote, to safeguard, and to protect it all now and for all time to come.

We are all proud of the heroism and the great deeds of valor and of gallantry of our immortal naval commanders. What true American is there from one end of the land to the other whose blood does not stir and tingle when he reads or thinks or hears of the heroic deeds of daring and of bravery of Paul Jones, of Wickes, of Hull, of Perry, of Lawrence, of McDonough, of Decatur, of Stewart, of Farragut, of Porter, of Foote, of Evans, of Phillips, of Clark, of Schley, and of our great admiral, the immortal Dewey?

Their gallant names, their heroic deeds, and their matchless valor brighten and illumine every page of American history. Their monuments, more enduring than marble or brass, are in the grateful hearts of their patriotic countrymen, and their illustrious fame will never die while American history lives, is read, and continues to be, as I pray it ever will, a beacon light to the oppressed of other lands and an inspiration to liberty, to freedom, and to equal rights and equal opportunities for all. No words can do them and their great deeds full justice.

But, sir, in this connection I desire to say a few words about another matter. If I had my way, I would make the Naval Academy at Annapolis and the Military Academy at West Point great national universities. I would make them great institutions of naval and military learning. I would open them freely to the youth of the land. I would make them as free to the poor man's son as they are to the rich man's son. In this regard, let me say, I agree with and concur in the policy of that great metropolitan newspaper, the New York Journal. I stand for that policy and will do all I can to carry it out. I would give all a chance, under proper rules and regulations to be prescribed by Congress. Instead of having one cadet at West Point and Annapolis from each Congressional district, I would have as many as could be accommodated by a proper enlargement of the two academies, so that anyone, no matter how poor or humble he might be, could enter and be educated, provided he could pass the necessary physical and mental examination.

I would pass a law providing that some of these students, when graduated, should spend a certain length of time in the service of the Government, and that others should go into the walks of private life, to be ready to serve the Government when called for in case of trouble or war. This is the true solution, in my judgment, of the making of a great navy and a great reserve army, and then men in almost every walk of life, educated at West Point and Annapolis, could command volunteers and ships in case of

war. I would like to see the way as open and clear for the youth of our country to go to West Point and Annapolis as it is now for them to go to Princeton, to Yale, or to Harvard.

The people are thinking about this matter, and the day, in my opinion, is not far distant when Congress will have to take some decisive action in regard to it. I know that nothing will be done now, that nothing can be done now, but there must be a beginning to everything. I begin this agitation. I know that many here think my proposition is impracticable, but let me say to you in all sincerity that what you think is now inconsistent and impracticable will be a realization and a blessing in a few years. Someone must make the start. Someone must inaugurate the discussion. Someone must make the first effort to bring about reform and a departure from old practices and obsolete theories. I have tried to do that to-day, and I doubt not that these few brief remarks, uttered without preparation or premeditation, will bear fruit and ultimately consummate this great reform at West Point and Annapolis so devoutly wished for by the young men of our land. [Loud applause.]

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Friday, February 24, 1899.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12106) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is the regular Army appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, and it appropriates four times as much money for the Army as was ever appropriated before in any one year in the history of the Government. It appropriates more than twice the sum asked for to maintain and increase the Navy.

This bill takes out of the Treasury—in other words, out of the pockets of the people—the sum, in round numbers, of eighty millions of dollars. The last regular Army appropriation bill carried only about twenty-three millions of dollars. What a difference! What a comparison! And yet, sir, it is said by those who speak with authority, who speak as experts, that this Army appropriation bill will cause a deficiency of forty-five millions of dollars. Alas, well may we exclaim, Whither are we going?

Let me repeat at this time what I have frequently said before on the floor of this House, that I am now, always have been, and always will be, opposed to a large standing army in time of peace.

In a Republic like ours a great standing army in time of peace is inimical to civil liberty, an unnecessary drain on the resources of the people, and a menace to free institutions. We do not need a large standing army of soldiers in a country like ours. They are consumers, not producers; they are tax eaters, not taxpayers.

In a Republic like ours we should rely on the volunteers in case of trouble or emergency. I believe in the citizen soldiery of our land. I speak for them now as I have in the past, and I stand for them. The history of the past demonstrates how useful, how efficient, how brave, how heroic, and how self-sacrificing they are. No words of mine can do justice to the brave volunteers of the Republic.

In praising the valor and the gallantry of our volunteers, however, I would not be just to myself or to them if I did not at the

same time give full and due credit to the regulars. We must have regulars, but in time of peace and tranquillity we do not want a single regular soldier more than is absolutely necessary.

As I have said before, I would keep the Regular Army in time of peace down to the minimum, and at the same time provide for a national reserve force of volunteers or militiamen, who should be drilled the same as the Regulars, organized the same, and equipped the same. This, in my judgment, is the true and the simple solution of our military system of army organization. If we would do this in case of war or trouble, we could in less than thirty days put a half million well-drilled, well-organized, and well-equipped soldiers in the field, the equal of any in Europe, regulars in every sense of the word.

If we would do this, the expense to the people would be very small and the results beyond calculation. Sooner or later, in my judgment, we must come to it. The recent war with Spain should be and is an object lesson to every citizen in the country.

And in this regard, without presuming, I would make another suggestion: The whole Army, line and staff, should be thoroughly reorganized, and patterned after the best military system in the world. If we would do this, there would never again be a repetition of the abuses, the negligence, the incompetency, and the criminality so flagrant and outrageous as those which occurred and disgraced the nation in the recent Spanish-American war.

In my judgment the conduct of the recent war should be thoroughly investigated. The American people will never be satisfied until it is done, and rigidly and vigorously done, by a Congressional investigating committee.

The commission appointed by the President was a whitewashing commission and only added insult to injury. That commission was unauthorized, without warrant of law, and had no legal authority to send for books, documents, papers, and persons. It could not administer oaths, its labors were abortive and impotent, and its report a roaring farce and a hollow mockery.

The people had no confidence in that commission, and treated it with the contempt it deserved. It did not elicit the truth. It did not try to. On the contrary, it seemed to studiously endeavor to avoid the truth, evade the damning facts, cover up the frightful fraud, hide the peculation, and smooth over the criminal corruption, incompetency, and negligence of those trusted with responsibility and high in authority.

Mr. Chairman, on the first day of this session—to be specific, on the fifth day of December, 1898—I introduced in this House the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and the same hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate the War Department and the conduct of the recent war between Spain and the United States, and report all of said proceedings, with their findings, conclusions, and recommendations, to the House of Representatives with all convenient speed.

Resolved, That said committee is hereby authorized and empowered to send for books, documents, papers, and persons, examine persons under oath, sit in any part of the United States, employ a stenographer, and that the Sergeant-at-Arms is hereby directed to attend said committee and carry out its directions.

Resolved, That the necessary expenses of the investigation be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

That resolution was in proper terms and would have accomplished the results desired. It should have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member. If it had, I would have had it reported and passed. The Speaker, however,

with great discernment of mind, no doubt thought as much, and quietly referred it to his own committee, viz, the Committee on Rules, of which he is the chairman, and there it has slept ever since the sleep which knows no awakening. All my efforts to get a hearing on it, or a favorable report, have been in vain. When it went to the Committee on Rules it went to its grave. From that legislative mausoleum no resolution ever returns, unless perchance the Speaker favors it. What a commentary on free institutions!

This session is now at an end. The Fifty-fifth Congress—the most profligate, the most extravagant, and the most boss-ridden Congress in the history of the Republic—has done its work and takes its place in the annals of the past. The people will weigh it and judge it. The verdict must be, and will be, one of condemnation.

Let me say here and now, however, that if I live to take my seat in the Fifty-sixth Congress I shall reintroduce the above resolution to investigate the conduct of the war and the War Department, and I will do all in my power to pass it and thus bring about an honest and a searching inquiry that will lay bare the facts and the truth, and let no guilty man escape. So much for that.

Mr. Chairman, I was opposed to the Alger-Hull imperialistic army bill, and I voted against it when it passed this House. It is now in the Senate, and I doubt very much if it will ever pass that body and become a law. That bill violated every principle of Democracy and invaded every safeguard of our free institutions. From the best information I can get the bill is now as dead as a door nail. And yet, sir, it is now proposed by the committee to pass this bill carrying appropriations based on the estimates of that bill. In my opinion, we should not pass an appropriation bill for the Army until we know just what kind of an Army we are going to have.

This bill appropriates eighty millions of dollars. The chairman of the committee says that is enough. The Secretary of War says in his estimates it will require one hundred and sixty-six millions of dollars to carry out the provisions of the Alger-Hull bill for the next fiscal year. The best mathematicians in the Treasury Department say to carry out the provisions of the Alger-Hull imperialistic army bill for the next fiscal year will necessitate an appropriation of one hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars. So whichever end of the dilemma you take, there is bound to be a terrible and a glaring deficiency. And the Treasury is nearly empty, war taxes continue without abatement, and the people are being robbed under the guise of law more now than ever before in all our history.

How much longer will the people submit? How much longer will they tolerate the wanton, the corrupt, the profligate, and the intolerant rule of the Republican party? Let them answer at the ballot box.

In the interest of economy, for the safety and the perpetuity of our free institutions, and on behalf of the tax-burdened people of our land, I enter my emphatic protest against a great standing Army in time of peace.

We witness to-day in France the results of a great standing army in time of peace, overawing the people, threatening revolution, stamping on civil liberty, burdening the taxpayer, subordinating freedom and justice to gold lace and shoulder straps,

denying a poor, innocent Hebrew a fair trial, laughing at law, and making free institutions a mockery and a sham. As France passes into the shadow of her former greatness—a victim to militarism—would it not be well, my countrymen, for us to take warning by the great lessons of history, and, ere it be too late, set our faces firmly against any innovation in our long and successfully established army custom? Let us make haste slowly in respect to a great standing army.

Mr. Chairman, during this debate a great deal has been said in regard to Cuba and the Philippines. The President, in his recent speech in Boston, said the whole Philippine question was referred to Congress; that Congress would grapple with the problem and determine what should be done with the Philippine archipelago. I hold in my hand an editorial from this morning's Washington Times in regard to a conference held yesterday at the White House. It seems to be authentic and shows how inconsistent the Republican party is; what a difference there is between the President's promise and the party's performance. I send this article to the desk, and ask the Clerk to read it for the information of the members and the edification of all assembled. It tells the story of perfidy and surrender.

The Clerk read as follows:

A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE.

This was the situation until yesterday morning when a conference was held at the White House, in which Senators Allison, Hawley, Hanna, Spooner, and Carter participated and at which the compromise with the Democrats was agreed upon. Senators Allison, Spooner, and Hanna have always favored any step which would render an extra session unnecessary. Senator Hawley, on the other hand, only two days ago proclaimed publicly in the Senate that he would accept nothing but "unconditional surrender" from the opponents of the bill, and Senator Carter insisted that the reorganization measure must be passed, pure and simple. These Senators were, however, willing to agree to a compromise yesterday. The reasons which operate against an extra session are mainly two, as follows:

"The discussion of the financial question, which would be precipitated, is avoided.

"By a recess of Congress the President is given nine months of unrestricted power to operate in the Philippines and solve the problems of expansion."

Mr. SULZER. That article, Mr. Chairman, tells the whole story, and gives the reasons why the Republican party has come off its high horse, and is now willing to accept a reasonable and a temporary army bill to tide over the present emergency. A few days ago the Democrats were told by the Republicans here and in the Senate that they must unconditionally surrender their opposition to the Alger-Hull bill. To-day—right about face, march—the Republicans have, forsooth, unconditionally surrendered to the Democrats. What a complete change of front! What a transformation!

The President wants Congress off his hands for nine months. He wants nine months more of unrestricted power to wrestle with Aguinaldo, nine months more of *unrestricted power* to subjugate the Filipinos. I have not time now to discuss this question as I should like to. I have decided opinions regarding the Philippine question—opinions I formed long ago—which I believe to be right, and which I will religiously adhere to until I am convinced that I am wrong. Some other day, ere this session ends, I trust I will get time to give my views on the Oriental situation. Let me now briefly, in the short time I have left, call your attention to the Cuban situation.

As a member of the Fifty-fourth Congress and of this Congress it is well known to all that I was an ardent, an earnest, and a

sincere friend and sympathizer of the Cuban patriots. I missed no opportunity, in Congress and out of Congress, to champion their rights and their cause. I aided them and I helped them in every way I could. The record speaks for itself, and I point to that record with pride and with some personal gratification and individual satisfaction.

Sir, I early saw that war with Spain over Cuba was inevitable, and when others faltered and held their peace I spoke out in no uncertain tones. I advocated war. I voted for war. I worked and voted to free Cuba. I voted for men, for munitions of war, and for every dollar that was needed to vigorously and successfully prosecute that war to a victorious determination in favor of the United States. I denounced the dastardly sinking of the *Maine*, and the villainous and cruel assassination of her heroic crew. War finally came. It had to come.

With all my countrymen I gloried in the signal and triumphant victories of Dewey at Manila, of Schley at Santiago, of Wheeler and Kent and Roosevelt at El Caney, at Siboney, at San Juan, and of Miles in Porto Rico. All our soldiers and sailors did their duty. They all shed luster and glory on American arms and added a bright chapter to our illustrious history. They were all heroes, each and every one. They have reared a monument to their fame that is imperishable. When the call to arms came there was no lack of men. Thousands and thousands who wanted to go to the front never got a chance to go. Thousands and thousands who finally were successful enough to get mustered in never got beyond the deathly and pestilential camps at home.

Mr. Chairman, my heart was in the cause of Cuba. I had talked for Cuba, and when the time came I wanted to fight for Cuba, like thousands and thousands of others all over this land. After the destruction of the *Maine*, and some time before the official declaration of war against Spain, I wrote the following letter to Frank S. Black, then governor of my State:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 9, 1898.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In the event of war with Spain, which now seems inevitable, I desire, through you, to place my services at the disposal of the State to serve my country in any capacity I can in defense of the national honor, for the glory of the flag, and for Cuban independence.

You and I served together in Congress, and you know how intensely I feel regarding the Cuban question.

When hostilities begin, if you will give me authority, I can organize very quickly a good volunteer regiment in the city of New York, and I appeal to you for leave to go to the front.

Trusting you will give this communication your earnest attention and advise me at your earliest convenience, believe me, as ever,

Very sincerely, your friend,

WM. SULZER.

HON. FRANK S. BLACK.

In answer to that communication to Governor Frank S. Black, of the State of New York, I received the following from his military secretary:

STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,

Albany, April 11, 1898.

DEAR SIR: Governor Black is in receipt of your communication of April 9, in which you offer your services in the event of war.

In reply thereto permit me to say that the same has been referred to the adjutant-general, from whom you will doubtless hear should occasion arise for such services.

The Governor wishes me to thank you for your letter and to assure you of his appreciation of your patriotism.

Respectfully,

GEORGE CURTIS TREADWELL,

Military Secretary.

HON. WM. SULZER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The next day I received the following from the adjutant-general of the State of New York:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS, STATE OF NEW YORK,
ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE, *Albany, April 18, 1898.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 9th instant, addressed to the Governor and referred by him to this office, tendering your services in the event of a war with Spain, and in reply am directed by the adjutant-general to inform you that the same has been placed on file and will receive due consideration should a call for volunteers be made. Respectfully,

FRED. PHISTERER.

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

Believing, then, that war with Spain was inevitable—that the conflict could not be postponed—I began in the city of New York, in conjunction with several well-known military gentlemen the formation and organization of a volunteer regiment. We enrolled over 2,000 men, and no better men ever stepped in the ranks. These men were all examined by two surgeons before they were mustered in. The regiment was thoroughly organized and drilled when war was declared. When the President's call for volunteers came, we offered the regiment immediately to the Government through the governor of the State. He refused it. Every effort was made to get Governor Black to accept the regiment, but it was useless. He refused to accept volunteer regiments. Nearly all the officers of this regiment were trained military men and most of them had seen active military service.

The lieutenant-colonel was Col. John W. Marshall, a most distinguished officer during the civil war. The first major was Maj. Peter F. Rafferty, a gallant soldier of the civil war. The second major was Gen. A. C. Fish, formerly of Ohio, and who commanded one of the crack regiments from the State of Ohio during the civil war. Another officer was Gen. Lopez de Queralto, who was a colonel on General McClellan's staff during the civil war, and subsequently served with General Gomez in the Cuban ten years' war. Another experienced officer of the regiment was Col. T. C. Campbell, a distinguished and a gallant soldier during the civil war. The officers were all duly elected by the men of the regiment, and nearly everyone was a trained soldier, who had seen active military service. After Governor Black refused to give us a chance, we did all we could to have the President accept the regiment.

On the 5th day of May, 1898, I received the following telegram from the regiment:

NEW YORK, May 5, 1898.

Hon. WM. SULZER,
Washington, D. C.:

We have 2,000 men enrolled and have elected you colonel. See the President. Will go to Cuba or Porto Rico. Governor Black will not give us a chance.

JOHN W. MARSHALL, *Colonel, and*
PETER F. RAFFERTY, *Adjutant.*

In answer to that telegram I requested the officers of the regiment to come to Washington to see and confer with the President and with General Miles. They came to Washington and we saw the President, who received us courteously and promised to accept the regiment if a joint resolution could be passed through Congress authorizing him to do so. The next day I introduced the following joint resolution:

Joint resolution authorizing the President to accept a regiment of riflemen from the State of New York.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President be, and is hereby, authorized—
3806

ized to accept for the service of the United States, in addition to the troops already authorized, a regiment of volunteer dismounted riflemen from the State of New York, the regiment to consist of 12 companies, each of the strength, on a war footing, authorized for the infantry arm of the Regular Army.

There was much opposition to this resolution and it could not pass.

General Miles was anxious to have the regiment mustered in. It was peculiarly fitted for active service in Cuba or Porto Rico by reason of the training and experience of its men and officers, and because about 800 of its members were Cuban-Americans who had seen service in Cuba.

The muster rolls and all papers and documents about, connected with, and concerning the regiment were filed, and are now on file, in the War Department. I doubt not many others in the country met with the same experience we did. No one, I think, who is familiar with the facts will deny the favoritism manifested in the States and at the War Department in regard to enlistments, regiments, and commissions. I cite these facts not to complain, but to demonstrate the martial spirit of our people—how anxious when danger threatens they are to volunteer and sacrifice their all on the altar of their devotion to country.

The whole history of the Spanish-American war is an eulogy and a pæan to the volunteers, and refutes every argument made by the advocates of a great permanent standing army.

I favor a great navy, and will do all in my power to accomplish that object and maintain it by liberal appropriations. But I am now and always will be opposed to quartering a large army of regular soldiers among our people in time of peace.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the time is at hand when the President should order the discharge of every man who left his business, his home, and his family to enlist for the war against Spain. That war is over and those men should be released at once. It is a great injustice to compel them now to linger in the camps or do police duty in our island possessions. I trust that every volunteer will soon be discharged and sent home to his family and his business. This is as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, we only need a few men in Porto Rico. We will have no trouble there. In a short time, I hope, all difficulty and all trouble will be over in the Philippines. In regard to Cuba the faith of the nation is pledged to quickly restore law and order in that beautiful island and let the people there establish a republic of their own. We must keep our promise. The Cuban people must be permitted to govern themselves. We should withdraw all our troops from that island before the unhealthy season begins. The Cuban republic, by the grace of God and American arms, must and will take its place among the nations of the world. [Applause.]

Here the hammer fell.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

February 27, 1899.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to come in immediately after the last paragraph on page 23, and I ask the Clerk to report the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add after the last paragraph on page 23 the following:

"That the number of major-generals in the United States Army is hereby increased to four."

That the President is hereby authorized to fill the original vacancy created by this act in the grade of major-general by the appointment of a volunteer officer who held the rank of major-general of volunteers and participated in the action against the enemy at Santiago de Cuba, but who did not hold a commission in the Regular Army of the United States: *Provided*, That upon the death, resignation, or retirement of said major-general so appointed by the President under and by authority of this act the number of major-generals in the Army shall not exceed the number now or hereafter provided by law.

Mr. HAY rose.

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SULZER. Before the point of order is raised, I desire to say a word. I shall be very brief, and I trust the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] will listen to what I say.

The CHAIRMAN. One moment. Complaint has been made to the Chair frequently this morning that there has been so much confusion that gentlemen interested in this bill can not proceed with it. The Chair trusts that all gentlemen desiring to engage in conversation will retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. SULZER. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply increases the number of major-generals by one, and the place so created is intended for that grand old soldier, Gen. JOSEPH WHEELER. It is only intended as a fitting recognition of his gallant services. When he dies the office will cease to exist. It will die with him.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me. I hope he will not be so ungallant and so unpatriotic as to insist on the technical point of order.

Mr. HULL. But a point of order takes anybody off the floor.

Mr. SULZER. That depends on the Chairman.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that I rose for the purpose of reserving a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] that the gentleman in charge of the bill made the point of order. This is a question which the Chair does not care to hear debate upon.

Mr. SULZER. But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a few minutes. I hope the Chair will hear both sides before deciding the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not desire to hear any debate.

Mr. SULZER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I desire to debate the point of order. I have a right to do that. It is only fair that you permit me to do so. Perhaps the Chair might not decide against me after the Chair hears what I have to say.

I believe nine-tenths of the American people know that General WHEELER was the real hero at Santiago. I believe they wish to see his ambition gratified in being made a major-general in the Regular Army. General WHEELER would rather hold that office than his seat in Congress. Let us gratify his ardent wish.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to say to the gentleman from New York that this amendment is clearly out of order, and the Chair has so ruled. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SULZER. Does the Chair deny me the right to be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. That is characteristic of the Chair. I simply desired to make a comparison between—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. SULZER. I will just so soon as I can get in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Ordnance service. For current expenses of the ordnance service required to defray the current expenses at the arsenals; of receiving stores and issuing arms and other ordnance supplies; of police and office duties; of rents, tolls, fuel, and lights; of stationery and office furniture; of tools and instruments for use; incidental expenses of the ordnance service and those attending practical trials and tests of ordnance, small arms, and other ordnance supplies, including payment for mechanical labor in the office of the Chief of Ordnance, \$235,000.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I offered that amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SULZER. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I offered that amendment in all sincerity and in all seriousness. It is similar to the one which was offered the other day to the naval appropriation bill by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody] in regard to Admiral Dewey. I am glad that no Democrat then objected to making the gallant Dewey an admiral. I thought no Republican would object to making WHEELER a major-general.

Mr. HULL. I have given notice already that I would raise a point of order on all debate not affecting this bill. I know what my friend wants to say, and I am reluctant to interrupt him; but he must know that he is out of order.

Mr. SULZER. I have the floor, and I trust the gentleman will not abridge my right to say a few words for the hero of Santiago—Gen. JOSEPH WHEELER. He will get along a great deal faster with his bill if he gives me an opportunity to speak a moment. I am a member of the committee, and I know when I am out of order just as well as he does.

Mr. HULL. I must insist on my point of order against my friend, as I will against every other man who undertakes to indulge in debate which is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York of course understands well—

Mr. SULZER. I think I am in order. I will try to confine myself to the provision of the bill under consideration. I think I have a right to say a few words in regard to my amendment. If you will leave me alone for a few moments, you will get along faster.

* * * * *

Mr. GAINES. What is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is that the gentleman was not confining himself to the amendment which he offered, which was to strike out the last word.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I was very glad, as I was saying a few moments ago, that no Democrat on our side of the House raised the point of order against the amendment making Admiral Dewey a full-fledged American admiral. He deserved it, and I think he ought to get it. So I think Gen. JOSEPH WHEELER should be made a major-general in the Regular Army. He deserves it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York—

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire now—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will please obey the rules of the committee.

Mr. SULZER. I am endeavoring to do that. I will get along all right if you will not interrupt me.

A MEMBER. You are pretty unsuccessful.

Mr. SULZER. But how can I obey the rules when the gentleman from Iowa gets up every moment and tries to take me off my feet and the Chair is doing all he possibly can to help the gentleman from Iowa? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is out of order.

Mr. SULZER. I regret that anyone here should object to making General WHEELER a major-general. No soldier in the Spanish-American war did more or deserves more than he. My amendment should be adopted unanimously.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman—

Mr. SULZER. I am very glad, however, that the objection does not come from a Democrat, but from the gentleman from Iowa. We will have some more to say on this subject at some future time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from New York that, having repeatedly called the gentleman's attention to the rules, the Chair must ask the aid of the Sergeant-at-Arms if the gentleman does not obey them.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not transgress the rules any more than the gentleman in the chair. Now, in regard to this section I desire to say—

Mr. HENDERSON. Regular order.

Mr. SULZER. I am discussing this section. This is no time for the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] to put in his oar by calling "Regular order!" This section is subject to the same point of order as the chairman of the committee made against my amendment. I want to say that this bill from beginning to end is full of inconsistencies. I can point out in almost every section of the bill provisions that are subject to a point of order. The bill is full of new legislation. In fact, we are legislating in the air. What is the use of making appropriations for the Army before we know what kind of an army we are going to have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the amendment that is under consideration.

Mr. SULZER. I am confining myself to it. I know you do not care to hear one talk like that, but I am telling the truth about it. I now make the point of order that the section under consideration contains new legislation, and, under Rule XXI, should be stricken out.

This bill from beginning to end is entirely contrary to the rules of this House; and no one knows it better than the chairman. He is getting it through; and we are not objecting. But when one of us endeavors to amend the bill by putting in a provision that will do justice to one of the greatest heroes of the Republic—Gen. JOSEPH WHEELER—the chairman of the committee, forsooth, objects. How petty it all seems. But let me say to the gentleman from Iowa the Senate will do justice to his bill and to General WHEELER, just as it is now doing heroic justice to the gentleman's Army bill. When it comes back, he will not know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to his point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Now, I object to this provision because it is new legislation, and I make that point of order.

Mr. HULL. Now let the Chair rule on the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York. I call for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order raised by the gentleman from New York is overruled.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordnance, ordnance stores, and supplies: For manufacture of metallic ammunition for small arms and ammunition for reloading cartridges, including the cost of targets and material for target practice, ammunition for burials at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several branches, including National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., and marksmen's medals and insignia for all arms of the service, including machinery, tools, and fixtures for their manufacture at the arsenals, \$500,000.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 14, page 24, the words:

"Provided, That the Chief of Ordnance is authorized to issue such obsolete or condemned ordnance as may be needed for ornamental purposes for the Homes for Disabled Volunteers, the Homes to pay the expense of transportation and other expenses necessary."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, I would like to ask if there is not already a provision of law which authorizes this to be done?

Mr. STEELE. There is a provision of law that has reference alone to the guns which have been condemned. But there are some old gun carriages that have been condemned and are obsolete that are being broken up and thrown into the scrap heap at the armories. It is claimed at the Ordnance Department that they may not issue the carriages under the law, but they may issue guns.

I ask a vote on the amendment.

The amendment was considered, and agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For overhauling, cleaning, and preserving new ordnance on hand at the arsenals and depots, \$50,000.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking an explanation from the chairman of the committee with reference to this particular paragraph.

Mr. HULL. What is the point the gentleman makes?

Mr. SULZER. I would like to know as to the amount appropriated here. It seems to be extravagant. I make a point of order against it.

Mr. HULL. This simply provides a fund for the overhauling, cleaning, and the care of guns.

Mr. SULZER. How much was appropriated last year for this purpose?

Mr. HULL. Not so much as this. But the gentleman must remember that we have a great addition to our guns now.

Mr. SULZER. If my memory serves me right, it was not nearly so much last year. Can the gentleman state about what the appropriation was in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. HULL. I can not state exactly. My recollection is about \$10,000, though I would have to look into the matter.

Mr. SULZER. And this appropriates \$50,000? Quite a little difference, and a decided bit of new legislation.

Mr. HULL. Yes. If the gentleman thinks it is too much, of course he can offer an amendment to reduce it.

Mr. SULZER. I do think it is too much, and the gentleman seems to be wholly unable to justify it.

I move to strike out the words "fifty thousand," and insert "twenty-five thousand" instead. I think that is enough for this purpose at this time, especially when we do not seem to have money for other purposes a great deal more important and necessary.

Mr. HULL. I hope it will not be adopted. We need the full amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in line 25, on page 24, the word "fifty" and insert "twenty-five;" so that it will read "twenty-five thousand dollars."

Mr. HULL. I would only say, in answer to the remarks of the gentleman from New York, that the Department of Ordnance thinks it will be necessary to make this appropriation, and that the full amount is needed. That is the information we received in response to inquiries addressed to the Department.

Mr. SULZER. If the appropriations were left to the several Departments of the Government on their estimates, there would not be a dollar left in the Treasury. They would take every dollar they could get if we followed their estimates.

To-day they want \$50,000 to clean old guns with brass mountings. Last year they only asked for five or ten thousand dollars. Next year they will ask for \$200,000. In my judgment \$25,000 is ample. It is all that is needed this year, and I hope the amendment will prevail.

ARMY REORGANIZATION BILL.

March 1, 1899.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with this grave and serious situation: We must either pass this bill, in my judgment, just as it is, or there will be no Army legislation at this session of Congress. That is the alternative. If we do not pass this bill it will necessitate an extraordinary session of Congress.

I want to do all that I can to obviate an extraordinary session of Congress. Every Democrat here should do all he can to avoid an extraordinary session of Congress. Although this bill is not perfect and does not meet with all of the requirements I would desire as a member of the committee, still, as the best thing we can get—as a fair compromise—I am in favor of it, and shall do all I can to pass it.

Fifty-five members of the Senate voted for it and only thirteen voted against it. Any delay, any amendment now will kill the bill, and the President will be obliged to call an extra session. The so-called Hull bill was opposed by the Democrats, and the latter, under the leadership of Senator GORMAN, suggested this proposition, the Republicans of the Senate assented to it, and we will be derelict in our fidelity to the Democrats in the other branch of the Legislature if we now impede or defeat this bill.

I trust that every Democrat who sympathizes with the men in arms at Manila, with our soldiers and sailors in the Philippines, will uphold at this critical moment the hands of the President and

give him the power vested in him by the terms of this bill. I am a partisan, but in times like these I always subordinate my partisanship to my patriotism. We should all be patriots to-day. We must not forget, we must not forsake our brave and heroic soldiers and sailors who are upholding and defending our flag in the Orient. We must all stand by them.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman had more time than I have, in which he talked about the people in the Philippine Islands. I have only a few minutes. I trust I shall not be interrupted, although I would like to accommodate my friend.

Mr. STEELE. I will give you the time to answer a question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. STEELE. I will give you a minute in which to answer it.

Mr. SULZER. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. Yes; I will now yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I want to know, if the proviso commencing in line 4, on page 18, is repealed, if it would not leave a standing army of over a hundred thousand men?

Mr. SULZER. No, sir; it would not, and I will tell you why. That proviso can not be repealed. It would be just as hard to repeal that proviso as it would be to pass a bill for a standing army of 100,000 men. It will never be done—take my word for it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will you please tell me why?

Mr. SULZER. In the first place, it is not repealed, and it will not be repealed. In the next place if it were repealed—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. That is not an answer to the question.

Mr. SULZER. Oh, well, the gentleman's question supposes something which does not exist. It is based on a supposition which will never arise. We are going to pass this bill. It will give the President all the power—all the men—he asks for now to suppress the insurrection. It will cease to be operative after July 1, 1901.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from New York allow me?

Mr. SULZER. Yes. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The enlistments under this bill would not be affected by the repeal of the proviso.

Mr. SULZER. That is quite true. In the first place, we are not going to repeal that proviso. In my opinion, no attempt will ever be made to do that. We should pass this bill, if we pass it at all, in its entirety. Any change in it now means its defeat and an extra session, when a permanent Regular Army bill will be passed. We can not evade the responsibility or avoid the positive alternative. By the passage of this bill now it seems to me we gain all we have contended for.

This bill is only a temporary measure. It will cease to be operative in 1901. The increase is only temporary. There is nothing permanent about it. It simply meets the present emergency.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do not think the gentleman caught the point of my question.

Mr. SULZER (continuing). Oh, yes; I think I have. And I hope the gentleman has grasped the importance of my reply. The responsibility for all that is now going on rests on the Administration. I do not think it is good policy to embarrass the Administration merely for political advantages. This bill can do no

harm. It becomes a nullity and repeals itself on the 1st day of July, 1901. Until then it gives the President all he has asked for.

I was opposed to and voted against the bill of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] because I am opposed to increasing the Regular Army to the extent he wanted to increase it. I thought the gentleman in the committee this morning favored this bill and would do so on the floor, but he has stood up here this afternoon and used every argument he can think of against the bill. I hope the members of the House will realize how important it is to pass this bill. Its failure now would be a calamity—an affront to every man in the Philippines.

The bill is not a perfect one. It is a compromise bill. It is only a temporary measure, and will cease to be a law on July 1, 1901. But, take it all in all, it does great credit to its author, and, in my opinion, I can not see how a Republican or a Democrat can consistently vote against it. It gives the President all the men he wants to meet the present emergency, and at the same time it does not increase the standing Army a single man. After July 1, 1901, by virtue of this bill, the Regular Army will be just the same as it was before war was declared against Spain. By that time, let us hope, the country will be at peace with all the world and the insurrection in the Philippines a thing of the past. This is no time to be captious. This is no time to split hairs or play small politics. We should do our duty. We should do what is right, and the people will judge us accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, just a few words more. My time is nearly exhausted. Some criticism has been made against the bill because it makes the chief of the record department a brigadier-general. The chief of that department is Col. F. C. Ainsworth, and a more efficient, a more competent, and a more industrious gentleman never lived. He is entitled to this promotion. He has made the record division of the War Department a model. His system has never been excelled, and the facility with which he can furnish the record of every soldier who was in any war in the United States is one of the marvels of the century. He has saved the Government thousands and thousands of dollars. When he took hold of that division it was in confusion—no one could find a record or tell anything about the history of the soldiers of the Union. Out of chaos he brought order, detail, and system, the best in the world.

The great work he has done is a monument to human effort, human endurance, and human ingenuity. Every member of this House is indebted to Colonel Ainsworth. No one who knows the facts and who has the slightest sense of gratitude will oppose his deserved advancement. He has earned, he merits, and a just recognition of his worth and services warrants this promotion. In my opinion it is one of the best provisions in the bill. I am always glad to speak a good word for an efficient, an honest, a competent, and a faithful public servant. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

TRAINED WOMEN NURSES IN THE ARMY.

February 6, 1899.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time at my disposal it will be impossible for me to explain to the House or to attempt

to discuss the provisions of this bill. I concur, however, in all that has been so well said by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GRIFFIN].

This bill came to the Committee on Military Affairs from the loyal, patriotic women of America. A committee of those women appeared before us and most eloquently urged its favorable report. I was impressed with all they said, and, on deliberation, convinced that this bill should speedily become a law.

The committee have unanimously reported the bill, and there should not be, and I trust there will not be, any objection to its passage to-day. It is one of the best, one of the most humane, and one of the most essential bills in connection with the Army that we have had before us in this Congress.

Every member of this House knows, if he knows anything, that at the beginning of the recent war with Spain the Surgeon-General of the Army was absolutely opposed to having trained women nurses in the field and in the camps, and he only finally reluctantly consented to it when public opinion forced him to do so. History has shown that the Surgeon-General's opposition was wrong then, and, in my judgment, events will demonstrate that the Surgeon-General's opposition to this bill is wrong now.

You all know what those brave and heroic volunteer women nurses did for our sick and wounded soldier boys in the camps and at the front. No one can speak too highly or too eloquently of their patience, their fortitude, their devotion, and their noble self-sacrifice in the performance of duty to the sick and dying soldiers of the Union. Every woman who went to the front to do duty as a nurse is entitled to the gratitude of the American people. Every woman who went to the camps and to Cuba to nurse the sick, the wounded, and the dying soldiers of her country is a patriot entitled to the thanks of Congress, and she should receive from the hands of the President a medal of honor to commemorate her patriotism.

* * * * *

I have introduced a bill to do that, and ere I leave Congress I hope to place it on the statute books of the Republic.

You all know how our soldiers sickened and died in the camps and at the front. In my judgment, it would have been much worse if it had not been for the trained women nurses. It is impossible to estimate the beneficent services they rendered. Many a poor soldier would not be alive to-day if it were not for them. Many a dying comrade had his last hours made comfortable by their tender care and angelic ministrations.

All honor and all glory, I say, to the brave women nurses who went to the front and in the fever-stricken and pestilential camps. They were all heroines—every one. Their reward is the consciousness of duty well done, and their monument is in the patriotic hearts of the soldiers of the Republic. We owe them a debt of gratitude we never can repay.

And in that spirit, sir, I contend that this bill should pass, and I hope it will pass unanimously. It will be a shame and a disgrace if any member interposes an objection. The bill is a good one in all respects. There can be no honest, no just criticism of it. The flimsy opposition sought to be raised here by a few gentlemen is a mere quibble and unworthy their gallantry or their patriotism.

We want trained women nurses in the Army. They are needed there just as much as trained nurses are needed in our hospitals. We want them in the Army in time of peace, and we want them

in time of war. We want them in time of peace to nurse the sick in the army hospitals. We want them in time of war to care for the ill in the camps and to minister to the wounded and the stricken carried from the field of battle. Their work is a work of their own—it can not be done by others.

* * * * *

My friends, a word more, and I am done. I notice my time is exhausted, and I will not detain the House.

To-day the patriotic women of America plead for this bill; to-day the brave soldiers of the Union ask for it and demand it; and in their name, in the name of justice to humanity and our own civilization, and, above all and beyond all, in the name of the loyal, the self-sacrificing, and the heroic women nurses who recently went to the front, I pray you, I appeal to you, to pass this bill ere this House adjourn to-day. [Loud applause.]
[Here the hammer fell.]

MONUMENT FOR THE FORT GREENE HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION-
ARY WAR WHO DIED IN BRITISH PRISON SHIPS.

February 13, 1899.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I desire to offer an amendment to this bill at this time—I will prepare it in a moment—that \$50,000 be appropriated by the Government, provided a like amount is subscribed and paid by the citizens of Greater New York—

Mr. MOODY. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SULZER (continuing). To build a suitable monument to the heroic and patriotic soldiers of the American Revolution who died in British prison ships in Wallabout Bay, New York Harbor, during the Revolution. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts in charge of the bill whether he will object to this amendment?

Mr. MOODY. I do not object to it now, but I reserve the point of order against it. It is a matter entirely outside of the function of this committee at this time.

Mr. SULZER. I trust the gentleman will not be so unpatriotic as to interpose an objection. I send the amendment to the Clerk's desk, however, and ask to have it reported to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 18, page 40, "that \$50,000 is hereby appropriated, provided a like amount is raised by the citizens of Greater New York, for the purpose of erecting a monument to the memory of the heroes and martyrs who died in British prison ships in Wallabout Bay, New York Harbor, during the Revolution."

Mr. MOODY. And against that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, just a few simple words.

With all that has been so well, so truly, and so eloquently said by my distinguished colleagues from New York [Mr. DRIGGS and Mr. HOWE] I entirely concur. It is well known to every student of American history that about 20,000 American soldiers died, or were ruthlessly killed, in British prison ships during the Revolutionary war. That crime was the greatest tragedy of the Revolution.

I do not think there can be a man on the floor of this House to-day who is so unpatriotic as to object to this appropriation. The Republic must not forget these men who died in the cause of lib-

erty and for her independence. The spirit of 1776 should be kept alive that freedom may survive. All that we ask is that the Government appropriate \$50,000 provided the citizens of Greater New York subscribe a like amount to build a suitable monument to these heroes who sacrificed their lives that the Republic might be born, to erect to their memory a monument fitting and proper to commemorate their heroism, their tragical death, and the deep damnation of their taking off. No tongue can ever tell, no pen can ever picture their misery, their suffering, and their sad deaths.

Mr. Chairman, many, many years ago in the city of New York the Society of Tammany, or the Columbian Order, appropriated a large amount of money and appointed a committee of distinguished citizens for the purpose of gathering together the bones of these Revolutionary heroes, which were then whitening the beach along Wallabout Bay, and give them decent burial. After a great deal of trouble, expense, and time the bones of these Revolutionary soldiers were gathered together by the committee, and they were buried amid pomp and circumstance, and with military honors, in the beautiful mausoleum in old Trinity churchyard. That grateful and patriotic act is one of the grandest, one of the kindest, and one of the noblest acts in all the great achievements of the Tammany Society.

I am glad that this matter has been brought up in the House to-day. It is a matter of much personal gratification to me to tell of this incident in the history of Tammany—a society of which I am proud to be a member, and which has always been true to the Republic.

* * * * *

The Government of the United States should have erected a suitable monument to these heroes long ago.

To-day we are celebrating the martyrdom and the heroism of the sailors who went down in the *Maine*. It is eminently fitting and proper that we should do so. To-day the patriotic people of the Republic are contributing money to build a monument to those heroes.

Why not, sir, on this memorable occasion, inspired by the patriotism and the heroism of the soldiers and the sailors of the Republic, pass this little appropriation and build to the memory of the heroes who died in British prison ships during the war for independence a monument that will forever perpetuate their suffering, their heroism, their martyrdom, for the cause of freedom, and forever demonstrate that republics are not ungrateful. Gratitude is the fairest flower that sheds its perfume in the human heart. Let us be grateful. Let us remember the *Maine*. Let us remember the patriots who made the Union possible, who saved the Union, who vindicated the Union. Let us remember our soldiers and our sailors dead, and our soldiers and our sailors living. All honor to them. All glory to them.

Yes, I am glad of this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to speak in favor of this amendment. Coming from the great metropolis of the Republic, I am glad to say that the grand old political organization of Tammany Hall, ever true to its tenets and its principles, years and years ago, out of its own exchequer, inspired by its own love for freedom, for the Republic, for the Revolutionary heroes, for the martyrs to liberty, gathered together these sacred and patriotic bones and buried them under the great mausoleum in Trinity churchyard, where they now rest.

I hope and trust that there is no member on the floor of this

House who will object to this amendment. If there is a spark of patriotic gratitude in the members of this House, it will pass unanimously. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a bill pending before the appropriate committee to authorize the construction of a monument to which the gentlemen have alluded in their speeches, and I have no doubt that the Committee on Appropriations will gladly make the appropriation for that purpose when it is authorized by law; but at the present time it is not authorized, and I am constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that such a bill has been introduced in Congress every year for the last seventy-five years, and it seems to have about as much chance of passing this House as a camel has to get through the eye of a needle.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

February 15, 1899.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The action of a majority of this House in defeating the Nicaragua Canal is to be regretted. There are only seventeen days more remaining in the life of the Fifty-fifth Congress. We adjourn sine die at 12 o'clock on the 4th of next March. Judging by the action of the House this afternoon it seems almost certain that there will be no legislation in this Congress to begin the building of the Nicaragua Canal.

I am in favor of building the Nicaragua Canal and of the absolute control of it by the Government of the United States. I trust and hope this Congress will not adjourn until some affirmative legislation is placed on the statute books in favor of that proposition.

We have spent practically all day yesterday and all day to-day discussing a flimsy point of order—a mere quibble, so to speak—as to whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] to build the Nicaragua Canal was germane to the bill now under consideration, and known as the sundry civil bill, or whether it was not germane under the rules of the House. The rules of the House seem to be for the purpose of giving the majority here the right to do, or not to do, just what it wants. One day they are construed one way, and another day the opposite way—doubtless on the theory that it is a poor rule that will not work both ways—especially for a partisan advantage.

The Republican party is in a majority in this House, and is charged with the responsibility of legislation. You can not escape the imperative duty which confronts you, nor evade the burden of responsibility. We know, if we know anything, that the people of this country are in favor of the construction and the ownership of the Nicaragua Canal. It is imperative, in my opinion, that we do something in regard to this proposition to build the isthmian canal before this Congress adjourns. If we do not, the Republican members of the House must take the responsibility, and if I mistake not they will hear from the people in no uncertain tones ere the Fifty-sixth Congress begins. The people are in no mood to be deceived or trifled with. They want action, rules or no rules. They want this work commenced.

The building and the ownership of the Nicaragua Canal by the Government of the United States is essential, from a naval and a military standpoint, to the integrity of our Atlantic and Pacific seaboard. Everyone knows this who is familiar with recent history. Everyone knows also that nothing could help our commerce and our merchant marine so much as a canal across the Isthmus controlled by the Government of the United States. No one will or can deny the benefits and the advantages that will accrue to us by the construction and perfection of the canal. In time of war the canal will be an imperative instrumentality for our coast defense, and for our own safety and protection. In time of peace the canal will be one of the great factors in the trade and the commerce of the world. Its benefits to us will be simply incalculable. No one can overestimate the advantages to us of owning and controlling the canal across Nicaragua.

Let me say to the gentlemen on the other side of this House that there are many who are skeptical regarding their sincerity in this canal matter. Some of you, no doubt, favor its immediate construction, and some of you, I believe, desire to delay it as long as possible. The facts will all come out ere long. If you are throwing dust in the eyes of the people, it will soon be known.

We have witnessed a spectacle here to-day which should bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every sincere patriot in the land. We have wasted two whole days splitting hairs over an alleged point of order raised by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON]. How ludicrous it all seems to a man who wants to accomplish the thing.

You all know that if you had devoted that time to a fair and an honest discussion of the merits of the Nicaragua Canal bill, either the one framed by the gentleman from Iowa or Senator MORGAN'S canal bill, which has already passed the Senate, we would have been able in that time to have thoroughly discussed the measures, and in some shape one of them would have passed the House to-day by an overwhelming vote. Your willful delays and your studied procrastination lend irresistible belief to the statement which has been going around that you do not want to pass any Nicaragua Canal bill during this session of Congress. Why, I ask? Is it on account of the condition of your Treasury? Or is it, forsooth, on account of the railroads?

In my judgment a large majority of the members of this House have been in favor, and are in favor now, of passing some kind of a bill to begin immediate work on the construction of the canal, but on account of the rules of this House and their technical enforcement in this matter you can not get a hearing on the bills, and we can not get a day in the House for their consideration. For one I do not believe the rules are sacred. I know they are not infallible. I would not permit them to restrain me from doing right. Their primary object is to prevent the majority from riding roughshod over the rights of the minority. We are here, however, for a purpose, and the essential thing is to accomplish something, to do something. We should begin at once to build the canal.

There is no time like the present. Every postponement means additional complication. Every day's delay is fraught with positive danger. The canal should have been built by the United States long ago. No other people would have delayed and dallied as we have. Everybody knows this. Everything that happened during the Spanish-American war demonstrates it. The trip of

the *Oregon* around Cape Horn was an object lesson for every man, woman, and child in the country. It proved conclusively the imperative importance to us of a canal across Central America. The recent trip of the *Iowa* and her companion ships is another object lesson that has arrested the attention of the thoughtful people of our land, and makes the immediate building of this canal an absolute necessity.

The people expect this Congress to pass the Nicaragua Canal bill. They will be disappointed if it does not. They want this Government to construct the Nicaragua Canal, pay for it with its own money, and then to own and control the canal for all time to come. There must be no partnership with England or any other country in the matter.

I favor the bill of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], and if I can not get that bill I will favor any other that will start work on the canal. I want to begin. I am opposed to any further delay. If there should be defects in the law, the defects can be remedied by subsequent legislation. Let us do something at once. The people expect and the country demands immediate action. Woe to the men who stand in the way of this great national enterprise!

* * * * *

My mind is so firmly determined in regard to the importance of this great canal project, that when the Chair this afternoon ruled the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa out of order, as we all expected him to do, I voted on the appeal from his decision to reverse the Chair. I am glad I did that. It is too bad that the Republicans of this House sustained the Chair in that ruling.

If we had succeeded in getting the Nicaragua Canal amendment on this appropriation bill, it would be sent to the Senate and finally to conference, and from the conference committee no doubt there would have been evolved some bill, some kind of legislation, to begin the immediate construction of the Nicaragua Canal by the Government of the United States. The thing to do is to start it; to inaugurate the great undertaking. Let us begin.

Many of you, no doubt, underestimate how intensely the people feel regarding this great question. We have dallied with it for years and years, and during that time we have appropriated millions and millions of dollars for worthless improvements on brooks and creeks and streams that many of us could jump across. What folly! How unwise and how shortsighted!

The gentlemen here know that, according to the best estimates that have been made by very competent engineers, the Nicaragua Canal can be constructed in less than ten years for less than \$100,000,000. To go on with the work at once would only necessitate an expenditure of from five to ten millions of dollars a year. Why, sir, a mere bagatelle to this great country, when we consider the importance of the project and the invaluable benefits to be derived therefrom. No doubt the canal would pay for itself and bring in a splendid revenue to the Government in less than twenty-five years.

The vote here to-day proves, if it proves anything, that the Republican leaders in this House are not in favor of building the Nicaragua Canal—at least not now. If they had been sincere and in earnest, rule or no rule, they would have attached to the sundry civil bill the Nicaragua Canal amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. The people of the country will understand and they will hold the Republican party responsible

for the defeat of the Nicaragua Canal. The Republican party must and will have to assume that tremendous responsibility in the next campaign. It will be a pretty heavy load to carry.

Now, sir, if we do not take action on this matter before this Congress adjourns nothing can be done until the Fifty-sixth Congress assembles next December, and it may be, and probably will be, too late then to do anything. I have no doubt, nevertheless, that many here desire that very thing. I say to the friends of the canal that we must take action now or we will lose the valuable rights which we have at the present time. We must take action now or we may jeopardize the possibility of the Government of the United States ever constructing or ever owning the Nicaragua Canal.

We must take action now, or some other country, wiser and more farseeing than we, realizing the immense possibilities and the innumerable benefits of a canal across the isthmus, may step in while we delay and build and own the canal, to our great detriment and disadvantage.

Let me, sir, say in conclusion, that every patriot in this House who believes in our Army and our Navy, who believes in our greatness and our destiny, who believes in promoting the safety of our seacoast towns and the integrity of our seaboard, who believes in our commercial supremacy, who believes in our maritime growth, and who believes in our future progress and advancement should stand firm for the building of the Nicaragua Canal, and bend every energy and every effort to secure its immediate accomplishment, even though it should necessitate an extra session of Congress.

We will be derelict in our duty if we adjourn before we take action on this vital question, and no apology will justify our inaction and our dereliction. Let us sink partisanship and stand together as patriots.

Now is the time to do something. Now is the time to act. Build the Nicaragua Canal, I say, and let us begin at once. Build it with the money of the Republic, build it with the brains and the brawn of the Republic, so that the Republic will not only own it and control it, but it will be our achievement and our monument.

I hope we will all be able to reach some conclusion regarding immediate legislation in favor of this great project for an isthmian canal before another week comes and goes. I favor now, as I always have favored, the Nicaragua Canal. If I can not have the bill I want, I will take any bill to start the work. I promise now I will do all in my power for the balance of the session to bring about its realization and its consummation, for the greatness, for the grandeur, for the glory, and for the integrity of the Republic. [Loud applause.]

PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION, 1901.

March 2, 1899.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, just a few words in favor of this bill. In my judgment it ought to pass without a dissenting vote. It is a good bill in every respect—in every sense of the word. There should be no opposition to it from any fair-minded man.

We have been talking and legislating for years and years about pan-American unity, fraternity, and closer commercial relations and intercourse. If this bill becomes a law and the Pan-American Exposition is held at Buffalo in 1901, it will do more, in my judgment, to bring those desirable objects about than everything else that has ever been done.

I am in sympathy with the objects of this exposition, and I believe it will do more for American trade, business, and commerce than we can possibly conceive of at the present time. It is sure to aid and help every portion of the Union. If this bill passes, it will be one of the best, one of the most unique, and one of the grandest expositions ever held on this continent. It is sure to be a great success in every way. It will be a grand object lesson to every citizen of the Republic and to the people of the South and Central American States. It will be a liberal education to many. It will bring us in closer contact with our neighbors in South and Central America.

It will give us a clearer and a better knowledge of the products of the field, the farm, the forests, the mines, and the seas from Baffin Bay to Cape Horn, and it will all be done by ocular demonstration. I am in favor of these expositions, and I believe the Government should lend its aid by being represented as an exhibitor. Money spent in this way is well spent.

All honor and all success, I say, to the farsighted and enterprising citizens of Buffalo who have undertaken this magnificent and commendable project. May prosperity attend their worthy efforts. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

EULOGY ON THE LATE NELSON DINGLEY.

Saturday, February 11, 1899.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. NELSON DINGLEY, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Maine.

"Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

"Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

"Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased."

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Representing in part the great metropolis of the nation, I would be false to my nobler impulses and to the people I have the honor to represent if I did not on this sad occasion place on record my poor tribute of esteem, of respect, of affection, and of admiration for the late NELSON DINGLEY. His death has left a void in the House of Representatives which can never be filled, and the announcement of his unexpected demise fell like a pall on the people of the Republic. His loss is a national calamity, and the country has lost a useful, an honest, a faithful, and a conscientious public servant. We miss him now, but we shall miss him more and more as the weeks and months come and go. No one can take his place.

There are many here who knew Mr. DINGLEY better and more intimately, but no one respected him more than I did. I became acquainted with him when I came to Congress four years ago.

In a very short time I was impressed with his sincerity, his honesty, his courtesy, and his industry. He was an indefatigable worker, and he accomplished great results. He was patient, tireless, and methodical. He seemed to be the happiest when he was the busiest. He died a martyr to his fidelity—to public duty. He never evaded an obligation and he never shirked a responsibility.

In many respects Mr. DINGLEY was a great man, a great parliamentarian, and a great legislator. His name is connected with some of the greatest laws on our statute books, and the great legislative work he performed will live and redound to his credit as long as the Republic endures.

To those who knew him well he was a kindly, genial man. He was loved and admired on both sides of this Chamber, and his name was a household word throughout the country. I do not think he had an enemy in all the land. He had a lovable character.

Mr. DINGLEY was especially kind, considerate, and courteous to the new and younger members of the House. He made their acquaintance, and was always willing and anxious to aid, counsel, and assist them. No matter how weary or how busy he was, he never refused to listen to the inquiries of the new and inexperienced member, and he always gave him good advice and the benefit of his great knowledge, sound judgment, and vast information. Many here will never forget how kindly disposed he was to them when they first became members of this House. I do not believe he ever turned a deaf ear to any member seeking information on any subject, and this generous characteristic has left a lasting impression on us all and gives us a true insight into his noble nature.

The career of NELSON DINGLEY is one we can all be proud of, and illustrates the advantages and the opportunities of American institutions. By hard work, by industry, by sobriety, and by perseverance he rose from a poor boy to one of the most important, honorable, influential, and commanding positions in the nation. The story of his life has been truthfully and eloquently told here to-day, and demonstrates anew the possibilities of human effort and human progress in this land of equal opportunities. Every hopeful and ambitious schoolboy should read the story of his life and endeavor to emulate his shining example. It must always be a fruitful source of encouragement to every ambitious youth and struggling patriot.

Mr. DINGLEY came of sturdy New England stock, the first American Dingley having come to Massachusetts in 1638. His ancestors were nearly all traders and farmers. He was born at Durham, Me., February 15, 1832. At 17 he was a teacher of a school near his home. A little later he entered Waterville College, and subsequently Dartmouth, where he graduated in 1855 with high rank as a scholar, debater, and writer. After graduation he studied law, was admitted to the bar, but left the profession in 1856 to become the editor and proprietor of the *Lewiston Journal*, and up to the time of his death he maintained that connection. He was a member of the Maine State house of representatives in 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1868, and 1873.

In 1863, when only 31 years old, he was the speaker of the Maine legislature. He was governor of Maine in 1874 and 1875, and a delegate to the national Republican convention in 1876. He was first elected to the Forty-seventh Congress in 1881 to fill the vacancy caused by the election of Hon. William P. Frye to the United States Senate, and he was a member of Congress ever since.

In 1894 he received the degree of LL. D. from Dartmouth College, and at the time of his death was a member of the Joint High Commission to adjust the differences between the United States and Canada. In the Fifty-fifth Congress he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the leader of his party on the floor of the House. His name is best known to the country at large on account of its association with the tariff act, which he prepared, reported, and passed at the beginning of this Congress.

This briefly sums up his career. His life was a busy one, and to the student and investigator will always be an instructive one. He was a simple Christian gentleman, and his public and his private life is without a stain. He loved books and art and science. He was a great legislator and a great statistician. He had finance and taxation at his finger ends. He was familiar with every detail of government, and his capacious mind was a storehouse of useful information. He was a deep and thorough student, and he exhausted every subject he touched. He had a wonderful knowledge of men, and his grasp of details was marvelous. To him figures and facts were as keen tools to the skilled artisan.

Mr. Speaker, many of us frequently differed with Mr. DINGLEY in regard to political and economical propositions, but we all admired his ability, his learning, his tenacity of purpose, his deep conviction, and we all respected his sincerity of purpose, the purity of his patriotism, and the inherent honesty of his motives. He was a direct man, a positive man, a truthful man, and above all and beyond all he was an honest man. In the years to come he will take high rank as an American statesman. The great work he accomplished as an orator, a writer, a lawyer, a thinker, a legislator, and a statesman will ever be a monument to human effort, human endurance, individual tenacity of purpose, and marvelous industry and perseverance.

He devoted the last years of his life to the service of the people and his country, and they owe him a debt of gratitude that never can be paid. He wrote his name high in the American temple of fame, and history will give him an immortal page. The good he did will live and will ever be a bright and beneficent heritage to all the people of all the land.

NELSON DINGLEY is no more. He fought the good fight; his race is run. He has gone to his long rest. A great nation mourns his loss, and a mighty people, shocked by his sudden death in the zenith of his fame and the ripeness of his powers, put on the garb of sorrow, grieve with those who grieve, and with bowed and reverential heads say, Well done, thou good and faithful servant—hail and farewell.

Mourn not the dead whose lives declare
That they have nobly borne their part,
For victory's golden crown they wear,
Reserved for every faithful heart;
They rest with glory wrapped around,
Immortals on the scroll of fame;
Their works their praises shall resound,
Their name—an everlasting name.

"THE TRUSTS MUST GO."

EXTRACT FROM SPEECH OF
Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK.

(From "Congressional Record," June 5, 1900.)



PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ANTI-TRUST LEAGUE,
1229 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.
1900.

"THE TRUSTS MUST GO."

From Speech of Hon. WILLIAM SULZER, of New York.

* * * * *

"I am opposed to the government delegating away its powers to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing precisely to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly. We should resist the encroachments of national banks on the liberties of the people with the same zeal and the same courage that Andrew Jackson resisted the audacious claims of the United States Bank in his day. And when the national banks impudently declare that the government should go out of the banking business, we should answer that the banks should and must go out of the governing business.

"In Jackson's day there was only one Nick Biddle. To-day, there is a Nick Biddle in every national bank in the land.

"We invoke the memory of President Andrew Jackson against the encroachments on the rights of the people of the national banks. They menace our Republic to-day. Jackson waged the most bitter and relentless war of his life against the United States Bank, and finally destroyed that gigantic monopoly. If he had not it would have destroyed the Republic. One of the greatest acts of his life was the veto of the bill extending the charter of that bank trust. In the light of what is going on to-day that veto message should be read by every citizen in our land. There is a bill now pending in Congress which gives to the national banks of the country far greater powers and privileges than were ever enjoyed by the United States Bank.

"If it should become a law it would give the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suited their convenience.

No corporation should have this power to make or destroy. It would deprive the government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and give to the national banks the right to paralyze, at their own will, every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power would be a crime against every citizen in this land and work woe and misery to millions yet unborn.

"To-day the great trusts of the country are practically supreme. Many of them are so intrenched in power that they are to all intents and purposes above the law and no longer amenable to legislative action. The crying evil of the times is the power and the sway of the trusts. They endanger not only our free institutions but our free men. The battle cry of the Democratic party should be, 'The trusts must go!'

"To-day about 400 trusts control, wholly, or in large part, every conceivable product and industry of the country.

"These gigantic combinations constitute, in my judgment, the greatest menace at the present time to our democratic institutions. They control the supply, monopolize the product, and dictate the price of every necessary of life. They force out of legitimate employment thousands and thousands of honest toilers. They enhance prices, reduce wages, and write the terms of their own contracts. They destroy competition, paralyze opportunity, assassinate labor, and hold the consumers of our country in their monopolistic grasp. They levy tribute on every man, woman, and child in the Republic. They blight the poor man's home, darken the hearthside of his children, cloud the star of legitimate hope, and destroy equal opportunity. They control legislation, escape taxation, and evade the just burdens of government, while their agents construct and maintain tariffs to suit their selfish ends and greedy purposes. They imperil trade, stagnate industry, regulate foreign and interstate commerce, declare quarterly dividends on watered stocks and make fortunes every year out of the people. Their tyrannical power, rapid growth, and centralization of wealth are the marvel of recent times and the saddest commentary on our legislative history. Prior to the civil war there was not a trust in the country, except the United States Bank trust, which Jackson killed.

"They practically own, run and control the government to-day, and defy successful prosecution for violation of law. If their power of centralization is not speedily checked, and they go on for another quarter of a century like they have in the past few years, I believe our free institutions will be destroyed, and instead of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, we will have a government of the trusts, by the trusts, and for the trusts.

"How much longer will the people humbly consent to be robbed and submissively permit a continuation of this outrageous policy of favoritism by class legislation? All legislation bestowing special benefits on the few is unjust, and against the masses and for the classes. It has gone on until less than eight per cent. of the people own more than two-thirds of all the wealth of our country. It has been truly said that monarchies are destroyed by poverty and republics by wealth. If the greatest republic the world has ever seen is destroyed, it will fall by this vicious system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few.

"The total population of the United States is about 75,000,000. The total aggregate wealth of the United States, according to the best statistics that can be procured, is estimated at about \$75,000,000,000, and it appears, and no doubt much to the surprise of many, that out of a total population of 75,000,000 less than 25,000 persons in the United States own more than one-half of the entire aggregate wealth of the land. And this has all been brought about by legislation during the last twenty-five years.

"The centralization of wealth in the hands of the few by the robbery of the many during the past quarter of a century has been simply enormous, and the facts and figures are appalling. Three-quarters of the entire wealth of our land appears to be concentrated in the hands of a very small minority of the people, and the number of persons constituting that minority grows smaller every year. The legislative schemes which have been most favored for checking this growing centralization of wealth are generally the most elusive and the most impotent.

"Impartial students of these startling facts and statistics can hardly escape the irresistible conclusion that a conspiracy exists, and has existed for some time, to convert the government of the United States into a powerful oligarchy of wealth. The millionaires, the plutocrats, the trusts, the monopolies, and the syndicates seem to be supreme and legislate for their own interests, benefit and protection. If it continues, the yeomanry of our country will soon be reduced to a condition of industrial serfdom more pitiable than ever existed before in the history of the world.

"The money power, the trusts, the syndicates, and the favored few of the land threaten the perpetuity of our free institutions by subsidizing the pulpit, buying the press, seating well-paid attorneys in legislative halls and courts of justice, stifling free speech and the right of lawful assembly and stretching out their tentacles to the colleges of the land to crush professors who have the courage of their convictions and dare to tell the truth regarding economic and social principles."

THE WAR TAXES.

When the Republican party once gets a tax on a thing
it never takes it off.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

FEBRUARY 19, 1900.

WASHINGTON.
1900.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, moves to suspend the rules and pass a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3339 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out of said section the following:

"In estimating and computing such tax, the fractional parts of a barrel shall be halves, thirds, quarters, sixths, and eighths; and any fractional part of a barrel containing less than one-eighth shall be accounted one-eighth; more than one-eighth, and not more than one-sixth, shall be accounted one-sixth; more than one-sixth, and not more than one-fourth, shall be accounted one-fourth; more than one-fourth, and not more than one-third, shall be accounted one-third; more than one-third, and not more than one-half, shall be accounted one-half; more than one-half, and not more than one barrel, shall be accounted one barrel; and more than one barrel, and not more than 63 gallons, shall be accounted two barrels, or a hogshead. The said tax shall be paid by the owner, agent, or superintendent of the brewery or premises in which such fermented liquors are made, and in the manner and at the time hereinafter specified."

And by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"In estimating and computing the tax imposed by law the fractional part of a barrel shall be halves, thirds, and quarters, and any fractional part of a barrel containing less than one-fourth shall be accounted one-fourth; more than one-fourth and not more than one-third shall be accounted one-third; more than one-third and not more than one-half shall be accounted one-half; more than one-half and not more than one barrel shall be accounted one barrel; and more than one barrel and not more than 63 gallons shall be accounted two barrels, or a hogshead. The said tax shall be paid by the owner, agent, or superintendent of the brewery or premises in which such fermented liquors are made, and in the manner and at the time hereinafter specified."

SEC. 2. That section 9 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. That section 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3341. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall cause to be prepared, for the payment of such tax, suitable stamps denoting the amount of tax required to be paid on the hogsheads, barrels, and halves, thirds, and quar-

ters of a barrel of such fermented liquors (and shall also cause to be prepared suitable permits for the purpose hereinafter mentioned), and shall furnish the same to the collectors of internal revenue, who shall each be required to keep on hand at all times a sufficient supply of permits and a supply of stamps equal in amount to two months' sales thereof, if there be any brewery or brewery warehouse in his district; and such stamps shall be sold and permits granted and delivered by such collectors only to the brewers of their districts, respectively. Such collectors shall keep an account of the number of permits delivered and of the number and value of the stamps sold by them to each brewer.'"

* * * * *

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] to yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, there is not, so far as I know, and there should not be, in my judgment, any objection to the passage of this bill. I am in favor of it and shall vote for it. It will be of some convenience, I am informed, to the brewers of the country, and I hope no one will raise a single objection to the bill passing by unanimous consent.

The point I desire to make, however, is that this bill is not what the brewers want, because it does not reduce, and, according to the statement of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, it will not reduce one cent the exorbitant tax now placed on beer. Beer is the poor man's drink, and it should not be taxed out of proportion to other commodities. The brewers of the country pay more taxes on what they manufacture than any other industry in the land. When the war-revenue bill passed this House the tax on beer was doubled. It was then increased from \$1 a barrel to \$2 a barrel, and under the war-revenue law the brewers of the country to-day are paying into the National Treasury over \$75,000,000 of taxes every year, and every penny of this, remember, comes out of the pockets of the consumers—out of the pockets of the people who drink beer. The brewers make the consumers pay the tax, and the burden falls mostly on the toilers.

The war with Spain is over and has been concluded for some time, yet the Republican party continues to levy on the people of this country the enormous, exorbitant, and outrageous war taxes. When the Republican party passed the war-revenue bill at the beginning of the Spanish-American war, and to carry on

that war, it promised, through its representatives on the floor of this House, that just so soon as the war was over the law increasing the taxes of the people would be immediately repealed. You have not repealed a single provision of the war-tax law, and, so far as I know and so far as the people of the country now know, you do not intend to repeal or to modify that enormous and unjust war-tax law in any particular. Tax the people into prosperity is one of the chief mottoes of the Republican party.

How long, I ask you now, in the name of all that is fair and just, do you intend to continue the burdens of this exorbitant, unnecessary, and outrageous war tax on the consumers, the taxpayers, and the people of the country? That is the question for you to answer, and that is the question the people intend to make you answer in the next campaign.

Do you intend to keep up the war taxes forever, piling up the people's money in the Treasury in order that your Standard Oil Secretary can loan the money out again to the Administration's pet national banks to charge the borrowers enormous rates of interest, and thus robbing the people coming and robbing them going? If that is the object, I would like to know it, and I think the people who are paying the taxes and bearing the frightful burdens of your imperialistic policy and expensive Government would like to have an answer to this very pertinent question. I pause for your reply. You can not answer, and I feel confident no Republican will have the courage to stand up here and give the desired information.

This bill is merely a little sop thrown to the brewers. You intend it to keep them in good humor. You have heard from them and you know they demand that the war taxes on beer be reduced to \$1 a barrel, as it was before the Spanish-American war began. The brewers have sent several representative delegations here asking for the repeal of the war tax, and they have filed hundreds and thousands of petitions in favor of it. But if I know your intentions, and if I am any judge of your policy, their mission has been a failure, their work in vain, and the petitions have been thrown in the wastebasket.

You do not intend to grant the brewers any relief and you do not intend to repeal or to modify the war-tax law in any particu-

lar. You are keeping it up, compelling the people to pay these enormous taxes in time of peace, in order to carry out your nefarious schemes in the islands of the seas, in order to convince the people that times are prosperous, in order to pile up in the Treasury a great surplus, in order to maintain a large standing army, and last but not least, in order to deceive the people and cover up the deficiencies caused by the Dingley tariff law.

If it had not been for the Spanish-American war and this war-tax law incident thereto there would be a deficit in the Treasury to-day, caused by the failure of the Dingley tariff law, of over a hundred and fifty millions of dollars. You know that. There is no doubt about it. For one, I stand here and tell you that the people of this country demand a reduction of the war taxes; they demand their immediate modification or their entire repeal. They will not get it, however, from the Republican party. The people of the country can rest assured of this. When the Republican party once gets a tax on a thing it never takes it off. If the people get any relief from the exorbitant war taxes they are now paying, it must come from and through the agency of the Democratic party. The Democratic party will make this question an issue in the coming campaign, and the people can determine the matter.

You will deceive no brewer in this country by the passage of this bill. The brewers of the country know how the Republican party has betrayed them. They have not forgotten your promises in 1896, and I believe you will not get as much help from them in the coming campaign as you did in the last. If the brewers respond again to your cries for campaign funds, they are more foolish than I imagine and deserve to be robbed.

The war taxes the people are now compelled to pay to bolster up the imperialistic schemes, the royal swagger, and the plutocratic policy of the Republicans outrage American rights. In my opinion the war taxes must be repealed, and the people who are struggling under the unjust and oppressive burdens of extravagant government, in the name of justice and common sense and economy, must insist on their repeal. The poor people of the country pay more than three-quarters of all the war taxes.

The rich people practically escape with the payment of a very small part of the taxes, and they refuse to contribute their just

share of the expense of Government by the payment of an income tax.

Mr. Speaker, if it were in order, I would offer an amendment to this bill to repeal all the war taxes; but as it is not in order under the rules you have adopted, I content myself with voting for this bill and at the same time entering against the exorbitant and outrageous war taxes the people are now paying my emphatic protest. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

4076



THE PUERTO RICO TARIFF.



SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 23, 1900.



WASHINGTON.

1900.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill is radically wrong in principle, against common sense on its face, clearly contrary to the dictates of humanity, and absolutely in violation of the letter and the spirit of the Federal Constitution. It seeks to extend to a limited degree the Dingley tariff law to the goods, wares, and merchandise of the people of the island of Puerto Rico, which island is now, and for some time past has been, a part of the territory of the United States.

It imposes a tariff tax on all merchandise coming into the United States from Puerto Rico, and going into that island from the United States, at a rate equal to 25 per cent of the duties collected on merchandise imported into the United States from foreign countries; and further provides that duties collected in United States ports upon manufactured goods from Puerto Rico shall be equal in rate and amount to the internal-revenue tax imposed by the United States upon the same articles manufactured in the United States, and in addition thereto 25 per cent of the duties now collected by law upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries, and that duties collected in the island upon manufactured goods from the United States shall be equal to the internal-revenue tax imposed in Puerto Rico upon articles manufactured therein, and in addition thereto 25 per cent of the duties now collected by law upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries.

In my opinion this bill violates the traditional policy of the Government, strikes a cruel blow against a portion of the people of our country, and makes a discrimination as unwise as it is inhuman

and unjust. It is one of the most iniquitous bills ever introduced in this House. I am unalterably opposed to this kind of legislation, and shall vote against this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman except the money bill?

Mr. SULZER. I said it was "one" of the most iniquitous bills ever introduced, and I repeat it.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, that is a stock phrase.

Mr. SULZER. That may be, but your legislation warrants it, and the word is none too strong and, to my mind, can not be too often used to fitly express your action here. You trample under foot the Constitution, and you ride roughshod over the rights of the people. The currency bill is an infamous financial job. This bill is an infamous tariff job, and they are both inherently iniquitous.

Now, Mr. Chairman, since the ratification of the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States the island of Puerto Rico has been and is now a part of the domain and territory of this country, and the Constitution applies to it, and should apply to it, just as much as it applies to the District of Columbia or the Territory of Arizona. To contend otherwise is as preposterous as it is untenable.

The people of Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States and entitled to the same privileges, the same rights, and the same immunities under the Constitution that the people of any other State or Territory are entitled to in the Federal Union. This bill compelling the citizens of Puerto Rico to pay a tariff tax on their goods, wares, and merchandise to and from this country is unwarranted, unjustifiable, unprecedented, un-American, and, in my judgment, unconstitutional. In all our past history no political party ever dared to attempt to pass a bill like this, a bill as inhuman as it is unfair, a bill that discriminates by special legislation against the people of one section of the country in regard to impost taxes.

The Constitution regarding this matter is clear and plain. Section 8 of Article I says in language that can not be misunderstood:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; * * * but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

This provision of the Constitution has been passed upon and interpreted again and again by the United States Supreme Court, and from the days of John Marshall down to the present time the highest court in all our land has always held that the laying and collecting of impost duties must be uniform throughout the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose and I have not the time to review the authorities. I shall content myself by referring to a few of the more important of them. John Marshall, in delivering the opinion of the court in the case of *Loughborough vs. Blake* (5 Wheaton, page 319), said of the clause of the Constitution requiring uniformity of duties, excises, and imposts throughout the United States—the very clause involved in this bill:

The power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any part of the United States? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the Territory west of Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises shall be observed in the one than the other.

In the case of *Cross vs. Harrison* (16 Howard, 198) the court clearly considered the territory embraced in California as a part of the United States within the meaning of this same clause of the Constitution.

I am unable to find any support in judicial decisions for the doctrine that the inhabitants of Territories have no constitutional rights, but exist only by the will of Congress. On the other hand, it has been repeatedly held by the Supreme Court that Congress is bound by the restrictions of the Constitution in dealing with Territories. The broadest construction I have been able to discover, given by any decision of the Supreme Court to the legislative power of Congress over Territories, is set forth in the *Canter* case, and holds in effect that Congress possesses the powers of the General Government and also the powers of a State legislature unrestrained by a State constitution. This interpretation would still leave Congress subject to those limitations which are imposed by the Constitution upon both the national and the State governments. Since the National Government is required to observe the rule of uniformity in levying duties, excises, and imposts, and

the States are substantially prohibited from levying such taxes, it follows that Congress has no power to tax thus unequally either in its capacity as a national or a State legislature.

Daniel Webster spoke directly upon the very proposition involved in this bill. On the 23d of March, 1848, he said in the United States Senate:

An arbitrary government may have territorial governments in distant possessions, because an arbitrary government may rule its distant territories by different laws and different systems. Russia may govern the Ukraine and the Caucasus and Kamchatka by different codes or ukases. We can do no such thing. They must be of us—part of us—or else estranged. I think I see, then, in progress what is to disfigure and deform the Constitution. * * * I think I see a course adopted that is likely to turn the Constitution under which we live into a deformed monster—into a curse rather than a blessing—into a great frame of unequal government, not founded on popular representation, but founded in the grossest inequalities; and I think if it go on, for there is a great danger that it will go on, that this Government will be broken up.

Numerous recent decisions recognize the doctrine that Territories are infant States. Among them are the following:

In *Weber against Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wallace, 65) Justice Field said:

Although the title to the soil under tide waters of the bay was acquired by the cession from Mexico equally with the title to the upland, they held it only in trust for the future States.

And in *Knight vs. United States Land Association* (142 United States, page 183) Justice Lamar said:

Upon the acquisition of the territory from Mexico the United States acquired the title to the tide lands equally with the title to the upland, but with respect to the former they held it only in trust for the future States that might be erected out of such territory.

In *Shively vs. Bowlby* (152 United States, 48) Justice Gray reiterated the doctrine of *Knight* against United States and *Weber* against Harbor Commissioners.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the true theory is that the Constitution applies to the entire domain of the United States, and while the power of Congress over the Territories is plenary, this term is only used in connection with the Territorial and municipal government which must be conducted under the authority of Congress. Congress thus possesses a power over the Territories which it does not possess over the States; but so far as the Federal powers are concerned, they operate equally over the States

and Territories and are to be exercised with regard to the prohibitions and limitations of the Constitution.

This is stated in *National Bank vs. County of Yankton* (101 U. S.), in which Chief Justice Waite, after stating that Territories are but political subdivisions of the outlying domain of the United States, said, with reference to the organic law of a Territory:

It is obligatory on and binds the Territorial authorities, but Congress is supreme, and for the purposes of this department of its governmental authority has all the powers of the people of the United States, except such as have been expressly or by implication reserved in the prohibitions of the Constitution.

In *Reynolds vs. United States* (98 U. S., 162) the court says:

Congress can not pass a law for the government of the Territories which shall prohibit the free exercise of religion. The first amendment to the Constitution expressly forbids such legislation.

In *Springville vs. Thomas* (166 U. S., 707) the court says:

In our opinion the seventh amendment secured unanimity in finding a verdict as an essential feature of trial by jury in common-law cases. The act of Congress could not impart the power to change the constitutional rule and could not be treated as attempting to do so.

In *Thompson vs. Utah* (170 U. S., 346) Justice Harlan said:

That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of trial by jury in suits at common law apply to the Territories of the United States is no longer an open question.

In *Murphy vs. Ramsey* (114 U. S., 15) the court says:

The people of the United States, as sovereign owners of the national Territories, have supreme power over them and their inhabitants. In the exercise of this sovereign dominion they are represented by the Government of the United States, to whom all the powers of the Government over that subject have been delegated, subject only to such restrictions as are expressed in the Constitution or are necessarily implied in its terms.

Now, sir, it being conceded that Puerto Rico is a part of the domain of the United States, and the Constitution enjoining that all impost taxes shall be uniform throughout the United States, it appears to me that this bill levying impost taxes of 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff rates against the goods, wares, and merchandise of the citizens of Puerto Rico is, and in the name of common sense, justice, and humanity ought to be, unconstitutional, and if the bill ever passes I trust, I hope, and I believe the courts will declare it unconstitutional and absolutely null and void.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; if it is not too long.

Mr. RAY of New York. I hold in my hand a book which contains a decision of the Supreme Court which overrules John Marshall.

Mr. SULZER. Well, God forbid that you should ever overrule him. [Laughter.] John Marshall was one of the greatest jurists that ever sat on the bench of the United States Supreme Court, and in this matter, with all due respect to my colleague from New York and the book he holds in his hand, I prefer to follow the judgment of John Marshall.

Mr. RAY of New York. I am surprised at the ignorance of gentlemen on that side of the House, and some on this side, on this question.

Mr. SULZER. Well, then, I will say that no one is surprised at your knowledge of the law. [Laughter and applause.] And to satisfy you I will now admit that you know more law than the Supreme Court ever knew or ever will know.

Mr. NEVILLE. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. NEVILLE. If the Republican theory is correct, that the foreigners pay the tax, how can the Republicans claim to be good Samaritans and at the same time impose a tax on the Puerto Ricans?

Mr. SULZER. That is an ethical question, and I respectfully submit it to my good friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. But let me tell you now that no Republican will answer it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I agree with the President. In a political way we differ materially in regard to legislation for the best interests of the people; but in regard to this legislation for Puerto Rico, if the President meant what he said in his annual message to Congress, I agree with him. Let me read what the President said to Congress regarding this matter at the beginning of this session of Congress:

It is our plain duty to abolish all custom tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

This he said was necessary because the island—

had been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed, and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish

sovereignty; that the markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without customs duties, now imposes the same duties upon these products as from any other country entering her ports. She has therefore lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in this market. The markets of the United States should be opened up to her products.

The Secretary of War in his annual report uses the following language:

The highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interest of this people as our own; and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

And as late as the 19th of January, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. PAYNE, declared by the introduction of House bill 6883, for which the pending bill is offered as a substitute, against the policy of this bill and in favor of free trade between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Now, sir, I concur in the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of War, that it is our plain duty not to enact a tariff law against Puerto Rico, but give her products free access to our markets; and that the dictates of humanity and the highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectations of the poor people of that beautiful gem of the Antilles—Puerto Rico.

If this bill should pass, the President can not consistently sign it, if he were honest and sincere in what he said in his message to Congress.

The overwhelming sentiment of the American people is against the passage of this bill, and in the face of that sentiment and the President's recommendation to Congress I would like some Republican to explain to me and the country the reasons why the Republican majority in this House are resorting to every conceivable expedient to enact this outrageous and unjust measure into law? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When this Puerto Rico tariff bill was introduced, it abolished all customs tariffs between that island and the United States; but when it was reported by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee it raised a customs barrier of 25 per cent against the

poor people of Puerto Rico. Why the change? Did the President ask it? Did the Secretary of War ask it? Did the people of Puerto Rico ask it? No; absolutely no! The people of the island of Puerto Rico strenuously object and urgently protest against the passage of this bill, and, so far as we are aware, the President has not changed his mind, although we know from experience that mind is like a weather vane, changing with every puff of political wind.

Why, then, was the change made? Well, it is said, and not denied, that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee made this change at the request of the sugar trust, the tobacco trust, and the whisky trust. I believe this to be the truth about the matter.

The agents of the trusts dictated this unjust discrimination against the citizens of Puerto Rico, and seem to have more power and more influence here than the American people. You dare not disobey the trusts. They own and control the Republican party. They are in the saddle and they are riding the Republican party to destruction. They make you sneer at the will of the people; they make you laugh at law and public opinion; they make you violate the imperative injunctions of the Constitution in order to obey their selfish dictates of sordid greed.

Now, sir, I would like to ask my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, what he would do if the agents of the trusts should come here and demand a tariff of 25 per cent against the goods and merchandise of the people of New York, or the people of Illinois, or the people of Oklahoma? Would he dare pass a bill laying tribute on the products of the people of those States? I think not. Would such a bill be considered just or constitutional? I think not. And yet would not such a bill be just as reasonable, just as sensible, and just as constitutional as the bill now under consideration? I can see no material difference.

The case seems to be analogous. As the Supreme Court has said, all impost taxes must be uniform throughout the United States, and to-day Puerto Rico is just as much a part of the United States as Alaska or the District of Columbia. In my opinion this proposition is incontrovertible, and this inhuman discrim-

ination against the poor people of Puerto Rico is a Republican outrage, an act of unparalleled injustice, a shameful protective-tariff crime, and all done by the Republican party to please the sugar trust, to placate the tobacco trust, and to paralyze the struggling industries of Puerto Rico.

Pass this cruel, this heartless bill, and what will the 1,000,000 starving human beings in Puerto Rico think of us? Will they not wish they were back in Spain? Will it not be a just cause for continued complaint? And will they not cry out against the injustice and truthfully say, in the words of the patriot fathers, "No taxation without representation?" Spain would never treat one of her colonies as we now propose to treat the poor Puerto Ricans. What will the people down there think of our boasted civilization and of our superior free institutions? What an object lesson to the world this bill presents of Republican duplicity, Republican injustice, and Republican subserviency to the sordid greed of the monopolistic trusts.

The other day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the spokesman of the Administration, said regarding this bill and the islands which came to us by reason of the treaty of peace with Spain:

We have got them, and we are going to take care of them. We are going to make all the money out of the transaction we can.

That sums the whole question up in a single sentence. The Republican party is going to make all the money out of the transaction it can. It is going to exploit the islands ceded to us by Spain and make all the money out of them it can. This is not expansion; it is imperialistic piracy—the meanest and most inhuman kind of robbery, because it not alone beggars the present generation but entails woe and misery on millions yet unborn, and does it all under the flag of the Republic and in the name of freedom and justice, magnanimity and benevolent assimilation. What an inspiring spectacle of false pretense and hypocrisy the Republican party presents to-day in its unconstitutional march to empire!

The citizens of Puerto Rico are an intelligent, honest, peaceable, law-abiding people. Recently they were visited by a frightful hurricane which did great damage to the property of the island,

and they are now poor and sorely distressed. We should, if we are true to ourselves, give to them instead of taking from them. Governor-General Davis, in his last report to the War Department, said:

I regard free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States as a necessity.

Pass this bill to loot them, and in all the years to come what will they think of us? The Republican party has deprived them of self-government and given them a military government. They have no representation here. Under Spanish rule they were represented by twelve representatives and four senators in the Spanish Cortes. They had their own local legislature and absolute home rule. Why, under the circumstances, I ask, in the name of all that is fair and just and decent, should we now tax them and rob them of the little they have? Have we made their condition better or worse?

Have we liberated them from monarchical tyranny only to enslave them in industrial oppression? The poor people of Puerto Rico will speak, and the great heart of the Republic will answer and respond in the coming campaign. The American people will never repeat in the dying year of the nineteenth century the crimes and the blunders of George the Third in the closing years of the eighteenth century. We have not forgotten our past. The spirit of 1776 still lives, and the American people will ere long again vindicate the immortal principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. In the sisterhood of States there must be no stepdaughters. The flag we all love must not be used as a cloak to rob and oppress our fellow-citizens at the dictation of the trusts and to bolster up the falling Republican protective tariff fallacy.

Mr. Chairman, I speak earnestly on this subject. My sympathy is with the struggling citizens of Puerto Rico. I want to extend to them the right hand of fellowship, and under the folds of the American flag and by virtue of the law of the land welcome them into the Federal Union. I want to help them, and not injure them. I want to save them, and not destroy them. I want them to love the Union, not hate us and despise our institutions.

I want to keep faith with them and do unto them as we would

that others should do unto us. The act you do to-day is a criminal act of Republican spoliation, and the consequences will be more far-reaching and more destructive than you now imagine. It is another step in your mad march toward imperialism and the subversion of our free institutions. I protest against it with all the emphasis I can command, and I solemnly warn my countrymen that the day is not far distant when the Republic will be destroyed if the wrongs and the usurpations of the Republican party are allowed to go unheeded, unchecked, and unrebuked.

The manhood of this country must speak out, the great conscience of America must find voice, the citizenship of the Republic must assert itself, ere it be too late and ere all is lost. Let us be honest, let us be fair, let us be just, let us be true to our past, true to ourselves, and it will follow like the night the day we can not then be false to any citizen in all the broad domain of our great and glorious Republic.

In the contest which is now on between the Republic and the empire I take my stand with the people against empire and in favor of the perpetuity of the Republic. Ours is the great Republic, the beacon light of the world, the refuge of the oppressed of every clime, the home for the downtrodden of every land, and it is incumbent and a sacred and imperative duty on those who are here and enjoying the inestimable blessings of our free institutions to see to it that the Government of Jefferson, of Jackson, and of Lincoln does not perish from the earth. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

BRITISH FORTIFICATIONS ON PACIFIC COAST.

"England never was and never will be our friend."

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

MARCH 20, 1900.



WASHINGTON.

1900.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

BRITISH FORTIFICATIONS ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report back a resolution with the recommendation that it lie upon the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa, Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, submits from that committee the following privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to inform the House of Representatives as early as possible what fortifications Great Britain is erecting, constructing, and completing along the northern frontier of the United States, especially at Puget Sound and other places on the Pacific Ocean contiguous to the State of Washington and the district of Alaska.

Mr. HULL. I ask the Clerk to read the report of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred House resolution 175, report the same back to the House, with the recommendation that the resolution be laid upon the table.

Indorsements 1 and 2 of the report of the War Department on this resolution are herewith submitted and made a part of this report.

Mr. HULL. I call for the reading of those two indorsements of the War Department, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

[First indorsement.]

ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE, Washington, March 20, 1900.

Respectfully returned to the Secretary of War.

The information the Department possesses in this and like cases has always been held to be confidential, and for good and sufficient reasons has not been made public. It is remarked, however, that Great Britain, so far as the Department is informed, is in no instance erecting fortifications trespassing upon our rights.

H. C. CORBIN, *Adjutant-General*.

[Second indorsement.]

WAR DEPARTMENT, *March 20, 1900.*

Respectfully returned to Hon. J. A. T. HULL, chairman Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives, inviting attention to the foregoing report of the Adjutant-General of the Army.

G. D. MEIKLEJOHN, *Acting Secretary of War.*

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the question is on adopting the report of the committee, that the resolution be laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Are we to have no debate, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SULZER. I should like to have twenty minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The motion to lay upon the table is not debatable.

Mr. SULZER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for twenty minutes on a side. This is an important matter.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, on the motion to lay on the table, we demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman object to giving me five minutes? I want to explain this resolution to the House.

Mr. HULL. No; I will not object to your having five minutes, if the House wants to hear you.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] asks unanimous consent to be heard for five minutes upon the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced by me in good faith and at the suggestion of patriotic people who have more concern about American rights than they have about British interests. There is a popular demand for the information called for in this resolution and the War Department should furnish it to this House, in order that we may be thoroughly informed of the extent of Great Britain's operations on our northern frontier.

There is nothing in the resolution which calls for secret information, and the answer of the Adjutant-General and the Acting Secretary of War in that regard is absolutely untenable. All this

resolution does is to ask for such information, not incompatible with the public interest, as the War Department possesses regarding the erection, construction, and completion of British fortifications on Puget Sound and places contiguous to the State of Washington and the district of Alaska. There is no reason why we should not have this information from the War Department, and no one on the Republican side of the House has been able to give any good reason for this adverse report.

It is very strange to me that the Republicans, and especially those on the Committee on Military Affairs, are so sensitive in regard to this resolution, particularly that part of it which refers to Great Britain.

That part of the report of the Adjutant-General to the effect that Great Britain is not infringing on our rights is ridiculous in view of all that is transpiring to-day and which is pretty generally known by the people of this country.

We contend, sir, and the facts justify it, that while Great Britain is pretending to be our friend and is lulling to sleep the Administration, she is secretly and stealthily erecting great fortifications all along our northern frontier that can only mean one thing.

These great fortifications are not being erected because of England's love for America. They are being erected in order to take advantage of us when we least expect it. That is the truth about it.

Great Britain's fortifications at Puget Sound and along our northern frontier menace our Republic, and on the shortest possible notice she will be in a position to destroy the property of our people and lay waste our towns and cities.

It seems to me that the Republican Administration is being humbugged by the ministry of Great Britain. To-day it appears that Congress can not do anything, and does not do anything, without the consent and the approval of Great Britain. Everything the Administration does is apparently dictated from Downing street. England never was and never will be our friend. As Jefferson said, she will never be our friend until we are her master.

This resolution was adversely reported from the Committee on

Military Affairs by a strict party vote. Every Democrat voted in favor of the resolution and every Republican voted against it. It is now before this House, and we intend to get the sense of the House by a roll call to ascertain who are the friends of America and who are the friends of Great Britain. The roll call will be a straw showing which way the political wind is blowing.

This resolution should have been reported favorably, and it should be passed by this House. It is important that every member have the information called for in order to intelligently vote on the military-fortifications bill which was reported a few days ago by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

I trust the members of this House will rise above party spirit and vote in favor of American rights against British interests.

The fact that this resolution has been reported adversely, if now sustained, will be evidence to the country that Great Britain has more influence here than the American people. There is a feeling abroad in this land, I regret to say, that the Administration has absolutely, abjectly, and ignominiously surrendered to Great Britain, and that British interests are now paramount to American rights.

The Administration has sacrificed American rights to British interests in Alaska. It has sacrificed American rights to Great Britain in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty regarding the Nicaragua Canal. Great Britain, it seems, dominates the policy of this weak, wobbling, un-American Administration, not only here but elsewhere, and is now seeking to entangle us with her European, African, and Asiatic troubles.

The Administration has aided and helped Great Britain in every way in its power to crush and destroy our two brave little sister Republics in South Africa. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In fact sir, if it had not been for the undue, collusive, and unfortunate haste of Secretary Hay, after consultation, no doubt, with Lord Pauncefote, and after being told what to do by Downing street, regarding mediation in the South African war, there would have been a concert of European powers offering mediation, demanding a cessation of war, and insisting on peace with the independence of the two Republics in South Africa.

It is high time, in my judgment, for some one who believes in

American rights, who believes in American principles, and who believes in, and glories in our history of the past to stand up here and tell the truth regarding the humiliating surrender of American rights to British interests by this pro-English Administration.

We will get a vote on this resolution and we will see, and the people of this country will see, who are in favor of America and who are in favor of Great Britain, who are in favor of the Republic and who are in favor of the Empire. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SULZER. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 94, noes 83.

Mr. SULZER and Mr. RICHARDSON. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 110, nays 96, answered “present” 28, not voting 116.

GOVERNMENT FOR THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.
THE LATE RICHARD PARKS BLAND.
ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.
SYMPATHY FOR THE BOERS.

SPEECHES

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

April 4, 7, 12, and May 7, 1900.



WASHINGTON.
1900.

SPEECHES
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

GOVERNMENT FOR THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

Wednesday, April 4, 1900.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill is intended to give a stable civil government to the Hawaiian Islands, and is entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii." Owing to the fact that nearly all my time for the past few weeks has been taken up by the investigation of the Idaho mining troubles now pending before the Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, I frankly confess that I have not had an opportunity to give this bill the study and the attention the importance of the subject under consideration deserves. From a superficial reading of the report submitted by the committee, and from a hasty analysis of the provisions of the bill, I believe, however, I can safely say that the bill now before the House is far from perfect and can be, and ought to be, materially improved by amendment.

I am informed that a number of amendments will be offered, and I indulge the hope that before the bill becomes a law the objectionable features it now contains will be eliminated and that the bill will be as nearly perfect as we can make it at the present time. These amendments should be adopted; and if they are, I trust this bill will pass.

Ever since the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States I have favored granting to our fellow-citizens there the very best form of Territorial government it is possible for Congress to devise. They deserve it; they are entitled to it; and Congress should have vouchsafed them this important right long ere this. I favored and voted for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, and I gave my reasons for doing so at that time. I am now, and always have been, anxious to give the people there the best and the most liberal kind of Territorial government.

There is imperative need of early enactment of an organic act for the government of the Territory of Hawaii.

The joint resolution of July 7, 1898, providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, declares that the Hawaiian municipal laws not contrary to the United States Constitution or inconsistent with the terms of that resolution remain in force until Congress enact laws. It was undoubtedly expected then that a Territorial act would soon be passed, and a bill was introduced in each House of the Fifty-fifth Congress. But other matters of great national importance so occupied the time and attention of Congress that the bill was not passed.

Meanwhile it has become apparent that there is much doubt of the extent of the power granted to the local government of Hawaii by the provisions of the joint resolution, and in many important respects it has created something like an interregnum.

Many doubtful questions of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction have arisen, as well as of criminal procedure, rendering it uncertain whether there is now any tribunal for the decision of important questions affecting property and any existing method by which criminals may be indicted or legal juries impaneled for their trial.

In anticipation of Congressional action, the election to fill vacancies in the Hawaiian senate was not held last year, and there is, therefore, no legislative power for appropriating money for public purposes.

There is also grave doubt concerning the power of the Hawaiian government to grant franchises for industrial and commercial enterprises, or for railways which have been projected, and the Attorney-General of the United States has decided that the Hawaiian government has no power to grant or lease any of the public lands for homesteads or for any purpose, notwithstanding the fact that the treaty of annexation declared that the proceeds and revenues of such lands should be devoted to the benefit of the inhabitants of Hawaii.

In many respects the business affairs of the Territory are brought to a standstill. Many Americans have bought government land since annexation, on which they have built residences and planted crops, but their land titles are now in dispute and can not be settled until the passage of this bill.

Meanwhile Americans can not settle in Hawaii on homesteads or land bought from the government, and a very desirable class of citizens is thereby shut out of this new Territory. The local government is unable even to make public roads over any part of the public domain of Hawaii, or carry out plans based on legislation prior to annexation for widening and straightening the streets of Honolulu.

The presence in that city of the bubonic plague is calling for drastic measures by the Hawaiian authorities, involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars. In order to provide for these expenditures, and to compensate the owners of buildings which have been burned in the effort to suppress the pestilence, it is proper and just that a Territorial legislature be provided by Congress with no unnecessary delay.

Since the adoption of the resolution of annexation large numbers of Japanese contract laborers have been brought into the islands, and delay in extending the laws of the United States to them will be taken advantage of to increase the number.

This bill proposes a Territorial government for the Hawaiian Islands similar to that of the later Territories of the United States—a governor, a secretary, both appointed by the President; a treasurer, attorney-general, commissioner of public lands, commissioner of agriculture and forestry, superintendent of public works, superintendent of public instruction, auditor and deputy auditor, surveyor, and high sheriff, appointed by the governor.

A legislature is provided, consisting of a senate and house of representatives, elected by the people. The Territory is to be represented by a Delegate in Congress. The Territory is made a judicial district of the United States, with a district court having,

in addition, the jurisdiction of circuit courts, with a district judge, district attorney, and a marshal of the United States, appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate of the United States.

The judicial power of the Territory is vested in a supreme court and in inferior courts to be established by the legislature. The laws of the United States locally applicable are extended over the new Territory, and the laws of Hawaii not inconsistent with the Constitution or laws of the United States are continued in force. The Territory is made a customs and revenue district and becomes subject to the tariff laws of the United States.

It needs no argument, it seems to me, to convince that if it be possible to give to the Hawaiian Islands a government like that of the United States Territories—a government which has met the approval of Congress and the American people since the Constitution was adopted and has proved itself adapted to the needs of a free and progressive people—it is desirable to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that there are many difficult problems to be solved regarding this legislation and that it will necessarily contain many errors and omissions; but, sir, I feel confident the citizens of the Hawaiian Islands will be able ultimately to solve the problems, and whatever defects this bill contains will soon be discovered when the law goes into operation, and time and experience and subsequent legislation will correct and remedy them. The all-important thing for us to do now, and do promptly, is to give the people of the Hawaiian Islands Territorial government, and the best, the freest, and the most liberal Territorial government the combined wisdom and judgment of Congress can devise. I am in favor of home rule and absolute local self-government for our Territories.

And, sir, I desire to say in this connection that what we do for the people of the Territory of Hawaii we should also do for the people of the Territory of Puerto Rico. There should be no selfish distinction—no sordid discrimination. A citizen of Hawaii is a citizen of the United States and a citizen of Puerto Rico is a citizen of the United States just as much as a citizen of the District of Columbia or a citizen of the State of New York; they are all citizens of the great Republic, free and independent, and under the dome of the Union sky, protected by the flag of our country, they are entitled to all the rights, to all the benefits, to all the privileges, and to all the immunities of the Federal Constitution. This is our plain duty, the imperative mandate of the hour, and for anyone or any party to seriously contend to the contrary is preposterous and in the end will be as unwise as it is unjust, as inhuman as it is indefensible, and as un-American as it is unconstitutional.

Any departure, in my judgment, by Congress from the well-settled, the successful, the time-honored, and the constitutional policy of the Republic regarding the government of our territorial possessions will be fraught with much danger to our free institutions and will be a step forward in the contemplated programme of imperialism. I am opposed to any plan or any policy repugnant to or in any way antagonistic to the fundamental principles of our national existence. The Constitution is my guide, and the Declaration of Independence the lamp that illumines my path. I am opposed to injustice, to militarism, to imperialism, and to industrial slavery here or anywhere else, at home or in our islands of

the sea; and wherever our flag floats, in the Pacific or in the Atlantic, in the States or in the Territories, I want the Constitution to be there, guaranteeing to every human being liberty, equality, justice, and every right of an American citizen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, this is all I desire to say at this time regarding the provisions of this bill. I shall vote for the amendments, and if they be adopted, I shall vote for this bill. But in connection with my remarks on this matter and some remarks I made a short time ago I wish to print in the RECORD some data in relation thereto that may be of interest to some of the thinking people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD some data in connection with his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HON. W. J. BRYAN ON IMPERIALISM—JEFFERSON VS. IMPERIALISM.

The advocates of imperialism have sought to support their position by appealing to the authority of Jefferson. Of all the statesmen who have ever lived Jefferson was the one most hostile to the doctrines embodied in the demand for a European colonial policy.

Imperialism as it now presents itself embraces four distinct propositions:

1. That the acquisition of territory by conquest is right.
2. That the acquisition of remote territory is desirable.
3. That the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed is unsound.

4. That people can be wisely governed by aliens.

To all these propositions Jefferson was emphatically opposed. In a letter to William Short, written in 1791, he said:

"If there be one principle more deeply written than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest."

Could he be more explicit? Here we have a clear and strong denunciation of the doctrine that territory should be acquired by force. If it is said that we have outgrown the ideas of the fathers, it may be observed that the doctrine laid down by Jefferson was reiterated only a few years ago by no less a Republican than James G. Blaine. All remember the enthusiasm with which he entered into the work of bringing the republics of North and South America into close and cordial relations. Some, however, may have forgotten the resolutions introduced by him at the conference held in 1890, and approved by the commissioners present. They are as follows:

"First. That the principle of conquest shall not during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration be recognized as admissible under American public law.

"Second. That all cessions of territory made during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration shall be void if made under threats of war or in the presence of an armed force.

"Third. Any nation from which such cessions shall be exacted may demand that the validity of the cessions so made shall be submitted to arbitration.

"Fourth. Any renunciation of the right to arbitration made under the conditions named in the second section shall be null and void."

If the principle of conquest is right, why should it be denied a place in American public law? So objectionable is the theory of acquisition of territory by conquest that the nation which suffers such injustice can, according to the resolutions, recover by arbitration the land ceded in the presence of an armed force. So abhorrent is it that a waiver of arbitration made under such circumstances is null and void. While the resolutions were only for the consideration of the American republics, the principle therein stated can not be limited by latitude or longitude.

But this is a time of great and rapid changes, and some may even look upon Blaine's official acts as ancient history.

If so, let it be remembered that President McKinley only a year ago (December 6, 1897), in a message to Congress discussing the Cuban situation, said:

"I speak not of forcible annexation, for that is not to be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression."

And yet some are now thinking of that which was then "not to be thought of." Policy may change, but does a "code of morality" change? In his recent speech at Savannah Secretary Gage, in defending the new policy of the administration, suggested that "philanthropy and 5 per cent" may go hand

in hand. Surely we know not what a day may bring forth. If in so short a time "criminal aggression" can be transformed into "philanthropy and 5 per cent." What beauty, what riches, the isles of the Pacific must possess if they can tempt our people to abandon not only the traditions of a century, but our standard of national morality! What visions of national greatness the Philippines must arouse if the very sight of them can lead our country to vie with the monarchies of the Old World in the extension of sovereignty by force.

Jefferson has been called an expansionist, but our opponents will search in vain for a single instance where he advocated the acquisition of remote territory. On the contrary, he expressly disclaimed any desire for land outside of the North American continent. That he looked forward to the annexation of Cuba is well known, but in a letter to President Monroe, dated June 23, 1823, he suggested that we should be in readiness to receive Cuba "when solicited by herself." To him Cuba was desirable only because of the island's close proximity to the United States. Thinking that some one might use the annexation of Cuba as a precedent for indefinite expansion, he said, in a letter to President Madison, dated April 27, 1800:

"It will be objected to our receiving Cuba that no limit can then be drawn to our future acquisitions," but, he added, "Cuba can be defended by us without a navy, and this develops the principle which ought to limit our views. Nothing should ever be accepted which would require a navy to defend it."

In the same letter, speaking of the possible acquisition of that island, he said:

"I would immediately erect a column on the southernmost limit of Cuba and inscribe on it a ne plus ultra as to us in that direction."

It may be argued that Jefferson was wrong in asserting that we should confine our possessions to the North American continent, but certainly no one can truthfully quote him as an authority for excursions into the Eastern Hemisphere. If he was unwilling to go farther south than Cuba, even in the Western Hemisphere, would he be likely to look with favor upon colonies in the Orient?

If the authority of Jefferson can not be invoked to support the acquisition of remote territory, much less can his great name be used to excuse a colonial policy which denies to the people the right to govern themselves. When he suggested an inscription for his monument, he did not enumerate the honors which he had received, though no American had been more highly honored; he only asked to be remembered for what he had done, and he named the writing of the Declaration of Independence as the greatest of his deeds. In that memorable document he declared it a self-evident truth that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The defense and development of that doctrine was his special care. His writings abound with expressions showing his devotion to that doctrine and his solicitude for it.

He preached it in the enthusiasm of his youth; he reiterated it when he reached the age of maturity; he crowned it with benedictions in his old age. Who will say that, if living, he would jeopardize it to-day by ingrafting upon it the doctrine of government by external force?

Upon the fourth proposition Jefferson is no less explicit. Now, when some are suggesting the wisdom of a military government for the Philippines, or a colonial system such as England administers in India, it will not be out of place to refer to the manner in which Jefferson viewed the ineligibility of aliens to prescribe laws and administer government. In 1817 a French society was formed for the purpose of settling upon a tract of land near the Tombigbee River. Jefferson was invited to formulate laws and regulations for the society. On the 16th of January of that year he wrote from Monticello expressing his high appreciation of the confidence expressed in him, but declining to undertake the task. The reasons he gave are well worth considering at this time. After wishing them great happiness in their undertaking, he said:

"The laws, however, which must effect this must flow from their own habits, their own feelings, and the resources of their own minds. No stranger to these could possibly propose regulations adapted to them. Every people have their own particular habits, ways of thinking, manners, etc., which have grown up with them from their infancy are become a part of their nature, and to which the regulations which are to make them happy must be accommodated. No member of a foreign country can have a sufficient sympathy with these. The institutions of Lycurgus, for example, would not have suited Athens, nor those of Solon, Lacedæmon. The organizations of Locke were impracticable for Carolina, and those of Rousseau for Poland. Turning inwardly on myself from these eminent illustrations of the truth of my observations, I feel all the presumption it would manifest should I undertake to do what this respectable society is alone qualified to do suitably for itself."

The alien may possess greater intelligence and greater strength, but he

lacks the sympathy for, and the identification with, the people. We have only to recall the grievances enumerated in the Declaration of Independence to learn how an ocean may dilute justice and how the cry of the oppressed can be silenced by distance. And yet the inhabitants of the colonies were the descendants of Englishmen—blood of their blood and bone of their bone. Shall we be more considerate of subjects farther away from us, and differing from us in color, race, and tongue, than the English were of their own offspring?

Modest Jefferson! He had been governor, ambassador to France, Vice-President, and President; he was ripe in experience and crowned with honors; but this modern lawgiver, this immortal genius, hesitated to suggest laws for a people with whose habits, customs, and methods of thought he was unfamiliar. And yet the imperialists of to-day, intoxicated by a taste of blood, are rash enough to enter upon the government of the Filipinos, confident of the nation's ability to compel obedience, even if it can not earn gratitude or win affection. Plutarch said that men entertained three sentiments concerning the ancient gods: They feared them for their strength, admired them for their wisdom, and loved them for their justice. Jefferson taught the doctrine that governments should win the love of men. What shall be the ambition of our nation; to be loved because it is just or to be feared because it is strong?

THE LATE RICHARD PARKS BLAND.

Saturday, April 7, 1900.

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that suitable tribute may be paid to the high character and eminent public services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a most distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect for the memory of the deceased the House, at the conclusion of these memorial exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased statesman and inform the Senate of the action of this body.

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: With all that has been so eloquently and so affectionately said here to-day regarding the life and character of the late RICHARD P. BLAND I concur, and I would not be true to myself and to my friendship and admiration for him if I did not on this sad occasion place on record my humble tribute to his memory.

For years Mr. BLAND has been a prominent national figure and his name a household word. He had friends and followers and admirers in every hamlet and every State in the Union. His untimely death was a sad and terrible shock to us all, and to his country an irretrievable loss. When he died, the whole nation mourned and sympathized with his bereaved family, and the Republic lost as true and sincere a patriot as ever lived. He was a true man, a friend of the plain people, generous and forgiving, sincere and patriotic, honest and truthful, zealous and indefatigable in the cause of right and justice. For a quarter of a century he was a towering pillar of the Republic. The work he did is a part of the history of our country, and it is fitting and proper that his colleagues in this House should set aside a day to justly commemorate his name and fame. As the years come and go he will be better understood and more appreciated. Posterity will give him a higher place in the Temple of Fame, and future generations will pay his memory greater homage.

RICHARD PARKS BLAND was born near Hartford, Ky., on the 19th day of August, 1835, and died at his home in Lebanon, Mo., on the 15th day of June, 1899. He received an academic education. He was an unwearyed student and an apt scholar. In 1855

he removed to Missouri and shortly thereafter to California, thence to that portion of Utah now Nevada, locating in Virginia City, where he practiced law for a time. He was interested in mining operations in California and Nevada; was county treasurer of Carson County, Utah Territory, from 1860 until the organization of the State government of Nevada; returned to Missouri in 1865; located at Rolla, Mo., and practiced law with his brother, C. C. Bland, until he removed to Lebanon, in August, 1869, and continued his practice there; was elected to the Forty-third, Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fifth, and Fifty-sixth Congresses.

The work he did for the toilers of the land and the beneficent results he accomplished for struggling humanity during his long career as a member of this House must ever be a part of the imperishable history of the country, and the future historian impartially writing the legislative story of the last twenty-five years of the American Congress will place him in the front rank of constructive statesmen. That record is the heritage he left his countrymen and will be for all time to come the monument of his undying fame. It stands for absolute truth, exact justice, eternal principles, equality before the law, and equal rights for all.

He was no respecter of persons, no hero worshiper. He believed in humanity and trusted the people. He had faith in the greatness and the endurance of the Republic, and battled all his life to perpetuate our free institutions and hand them down unimpaired to future generations. He was a plain, simple man who loved his fellow-man. He was a believer in the fundamental principles that constitute our national existence and he trod the path of the patriot fathers. He was a disciple of Thomas Jefferson and struggled to keep the Government pure and in the control of the people. He turned his back on caste, combated privilege, and was the relentless foe of monopoly. He was a unique man in many ways. His nature was without guile; he hated cant, spurned pretense, and despised hypocrisy. He was the friend of the Constitution, and no argument, no sophistry, could persuade him from the path of duty. He did his works bravely and fearlessly in the face of obstacles that would appall a weaker and a more timid man.

In the great battle for the people's rights he never wearied, and the marshaled hosts of error never conquered him. Year in and year out he fought the good fight; he kept the faith. He lived truly, he thought truly, and he spoke truly. His life was as placid as a summer stream, and made him loved by all who knew him. His words uttered here for the defenseless were always respectfully listened to by admiring friends and doubting opponents, and were read and reread by innumerable millions. He spoke the truth for the countless who were robbed and oppressed for the enrichment and the benefit of the few, and he knew the truth would ultimately triumph and that his efforts for the rights of the people would sooner or later be crowned with success.

Think truly, and thy thought
Shall the world's great famine feed;
Speak truly, and each word of thine
Shall be a fruitful seed;
Live truly, and thy life shall be
A grand and noble creed.

Such a man was RICHARD PARKS BLAND—a truly great, a truly good, a truly honest man in all things.

The great and immortal truths he uttered were not uttered in vain. They have borne and will continue to bear abundant fruit. His cause will live, and, in my opinion, the day is not far distant when the principles he contended for will be written on the statute books of America, an everlasting monument to his wisdom, his foresight, and his unerring judgment. The martyr dies; the cause survives. Man goeth to his long home, but his works live after him.

Mr. BLAND was a faithful public servant. He never betrayed a friend, a trust, or a principle. He always fought fair and open and aboveboard. He never resorted to trickery, to device, or to chicanery. He had no tricks of speech. He was a plain, blunt man, who never used words to conceal thoughts. He told the truth and told it in the simplest and most direct way. He went to the root of the subject. His heart was in all he did, in all he said, and he was great and eloquent and impressive because he was simple, honest, and sincere, and every word he uttered had the genuine ring of truth. He never despaired. He had the rectitude and patience of the rocks, the hope of the stream rushing to meet the ocean, the fidelity of the sun.

He believed in equal opportunity, encouraged worth, applauded manly effort, and wanted man to be free and stand erect. He was a great commoner; he sympathized with those who toil and struggle; he believed in the love of home, the sanctity of the hearthside, and his great responsive heart went out to comfort the sad, the sorrowing, and the disconsolate. He was the foe of tyranny, the enemy of bigotry, the eternal adversary of oppression. He was the champion of the masses, the friend of the downtrodden, the pioneer and the leader of the reform forces of the Republic against the serried ranks of the predatory classes.

Humanity was his constituency, to do good his political creed. He stood for the weak against the strong, for the lowly against the powerful, for the oppressed against the oppressor, for the right against the wrong, for truth against error, for every cause that lacked assistance, and, above all and beyond all, he stood, in all places and at all times, for the rights of man. When he died a great tree in the forests of the people fell and a great light in the Republic went out. We who follow after him, imbued with his noble example and inspired by his civic virtues, will heroically take up his burden, push forward his cause, and continue his fight until the battle is won and the mighty principles he contended for are forever triumphant. I believe if he were here to-day this would be his message, his wish to us, and that he would say to all as the poetess of America has so truly said to the world:

Let those who have failed take courage,
Though the enemy seemed to have won,
Though his ranks are strong, if he be in the wrong,
The battle is not yet done.
For sure as the morning follows
The darkest hour of the night,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

O man bowed down with labor,
O woman young, yet old,
O heart oppressed in the toiler's breast
And crushed by the power of gold,
Keep on with your weary battle
Against triumphant might,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

Thursday, April 12, 1900.

The House having under consideration House joint resolution No. 28, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The joint resolution now before the House and under discussion proposes to amend the Constitution so that Senators in Congress shall be elected directly by the people. I am in favor of the people electing United States Senators. Ever since I have been a member of this House I have worked faithfully to bring about this desirable reform. I introduced this joint resolution in the Fifty-fourth Congress, I introduced it in the Fifty-fifth Congress, and I reintroduced it the first day of this Congress. It passed this House by an almost unanimous vote in the last Congress, but failed to pass the Senate. For years, in Congress and out of Congress, in season and out of season, I have favored, discussed, and agitated this proposition. I believe it is right, I know the people favor it, and I hope every member of this House will now vote for it. The people all over this country demand this change in the Constitution and appeal to us to pass this resolution to give them this right.

This appeal is not sectional, nor is it partisan. It reaches us from all sections and from the different political parties with a degree of unanimity quite surprising and unaccountable, if not guided and impelled by a sense of righteous indignation, aroused by reports and accusations of alleged methods sometimes employed by gentlemen whose ambitions lead them to seek a seat in the Senate of the United States. We can well afford, indeed, as their representatives it is our bounden duty, to respect the wishes and do the will of the people and give them a uniform law allowing them by direct vote to elect their Senators.

It has been said that our action in passing this resolution will be useless and a waste of time, for the reason that the Senators will never consent to a change in the mode of their selection. That may be true in regard to some of the Senators, but I know it is not true in regard to all of them. Many of them favor this change and will advocate it. I know also that this resolution may fail this time, as it has failed to pass the Senate before, but those who believe in this change will not give up the struggle to bring it about, and sooner or later it will be adopted.

If a majority of Senators oppose the adoption of this resolution in this Congress and, from personal motives, mistaken ideas, or narrow-minded views, vote it down, the agitation of the people for this change will not cease, but will become more pronounced and more determined until there is a Senate that will respond to their wishes and enact legislation that will give the people the right to elect their United States Senators as well as their Representatives in Congress. Do not be deceived; make no mistake. This reform is growing more popular every year and is destined to come in the near future. I trust it will come this year and that the Senate will concur in the judgment of this House before this Congress adjourns.

In recent years there has been much scandal in several States regarding the election of United States Senators by the State legislatures. These scandalous elections are becoming more flagrant

and more frequent. The adoption of this amendment will prevent corruption, stop scandals, and to a great extent eliminate the temptation to gerrymander for partisan purposes.

Let me say to this House that this legislative gerrymandering has been carried further by the Republican party in my own State of New York than perhaps any other State in the Union. In the State of New York, under the present outrageous Republican apportionment, the people can not secure a Democratic legislature unless the Democratic party carries the State by at least a plurality of 100,000 votes.

The Republicans in their partisanship went so far that they wrote in our State constitution a provision that no matter what the population of Greater New York should be, no matter if it were twice as large as the population in the rest of the State, the city of Greater New York should never have more than one-half the members in the upper branch of our State legislature.

I believe the change in our Federal Constitution sought to be made by this resolution will almost entirely prevent these unfair and outrageous apportionments and at the same time give the poor man the same opportunity under the law as the wealthy one to submit his cause and his candidacy to the arbitration of the people for the high and honorable office of a Senator in Congress.

I favor this change in the Constitution, as I shall every other that will restore the Government to the control of the people. I want the people, in fact as well as in theory, to rule this great Republic and the Government to be directly responsible and immediately responsive to their will. I believe in the people, and I trust the people. In my judgment, the people can and ought to be trusted.

If the people can not be trusted, if they can be corrupted, coerced, influenced, or intimidated, then representative government is a failure and the free institutions of the Republic are doomed. We must rely on the people, and we should legislate at all times in their interest.

With the adoption of this amendment to the Constitution it will be impossible to defeat the will of the people, and the vacancies that are now too frequent in the Senate and occupy the time and attention of that body would never occur.

Mr. Speaker, there is a rapidly growing sentiment all over the country in favor of this change in the mode of electing Senators in Congress. It is a most important question to the people, and the Senate will make a sad mistake if it attempts to ignore it.

The legislatures of thirty-four States have formally indorsed this proposed amendment to the Constitution, and I firmly believe, if the Senate will now pass it, that every State in the Union will speedily ratify it, and it will become a part of the supreme law of the land. The people are in earnest in this matter, and any attempt to thwart their will in securing this reform will only hasten its consummation.

I am opposed to delegating away the rights of the people, and where they have been delegated I would restore them to the people. For one hundred years and more the distrust of the people by some of the founders of the Republic, as embodied in our Federal Constitution, has stood as fixed and immutable as the laws of the Medes and the Persians.

I am a friend of the Constitution and share in the patriotic sentiment which is prompt to challenge almost every proposition to

amend it. But, sir, I sincerely believe the man who would boldly point out the defects in our great Magna Charta and honestly seek to remedy them is a better friend of the Constitution than he who will not see its faults, or, seeing them, endeavors to justify them from motives of mistaken zeal.

The right to elect United States Senators by the people is a step in advance and in the right direction. I hope it will speedily be brought about. It is the right kind of reform, in the interest of the many and for the benefit of all the people, and its accomplishment will keep the Government nearer the masses and herald a better and a brighter day in the onward march of the Republic. [Applause.]

SYMPATHY FOR THE BOERS.

May 7, 1900.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules for the purpose of passing the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is out of order. The Journal has not been approved. Without objection, the Journal will be considered as approved. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE TWELFTH CENSUS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 10696, an act relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving the Director thereof additional power to print in certain cases, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM was recognized.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I thought I had the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York was not recognized.

Mr. SULZER. I understood that I had the floor and would be recognized as soon as the Journal was approved.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York was not recognized, and the Chair may as well state that the Chair will recognize no gentleman unless he has some knowledge of what is going to be called up.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to have the resolution read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not been recognized.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3537) to grant authority to change the name of the steamship *Paris*.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from New York.

* * * * *

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SULZER. I rise for the purpose of moving a suspension of

the rules, this being suspension day, for the purpose of passing a resolution sympathizing with the patriotic Boers in their struggle to maintain their freedom and independence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to recognize the gentleman from New York at this time.

Mr. SULZER. Does the Chair refuse to recognize me because—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is out of order.

Mr. SULZER (continuing). The Speaker is opposed to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will take his seat; the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SULZER. My parliamentary inquiry is, Have I no rights on the floor of this House, as a member, to move a suspension of the rules on suspension day?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not making a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair must exercise his duty to this House and recognize members upon matters which the Chair thinks should be considered.

* * * * *

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, the measure now before the House is in the interest of the soldiers of the Union, and I am in favor of it and shall vote for the bill. I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of the men who saved the Union, and I shall always favor the most liberal pension legislation in the interest of our heroic soldiers, their widows, and their orphans. I would make the pension roll a roll of honor to the friends of liberty and the brave defenders of our national existence. All glory, I say, to the brave men who fought for freedom in the dark hours from 1861 to 1865.

And, sir, in this connection I want to say all honor and all glory to the brave men who are now fighting for freedom and republican institutions on the veldts of South Africa. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to say a few words in favor of the Boers. I want the liberty-loving people of this country to know why official America refuses to sympathize with them in their struggle to maintain their independence. You Republicans stand up here and talk of freedom, of liberty, and about patriotism, but you dare not pass a resolution through this House extending sympathy to the liberty-loving and patriotic Boers of South Africa. Official America sneezes when Downing street takes snuff. Republicans, I dare you to permit this resolution in favor of the Boers to come to a vote.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SULZER. I have only five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPRON). The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. SULZER. This morning—this being suspension day and the motion being in order—in accordance with the rules, in accordance with my rights as a member of this House, I moved to suspend the rules and pass the following resolutions:

Resolved, That we watch with deep and abiding interest the war between Great Britain and the South African Republics, and, with full determina-

tion to maintain a proper neutrality between the contending forces, we can not withhold our sympathy from the struggling people of the Republics, and it is our earnest desire that the Government of the United States, by its friendly offices offered to both powers, may assist in bringing the war to a speedy conclusion in a manner honorable to both Great Britain and the African Republics.

Now, sir, the Speaker, in violation of the Rules of this House and contrary to all parliamentary precedents, arbitrarily ruled my motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution as out of order, and ordered me to take my seat. His action, as witnessed here this morning, clearly demonstrates that the Republican party is opposed to the Boers in their struggle to maintain their freedom and independence and is in secret sympathy with the Empire of Great Britain in its cruel, predatory, and rapacious war to devastate and exterminate the two little Republics of South Africa. The Speaker says he will not recognize a member of this House unless he knows in advance the purpose for which the member rises. If his position is right, then he is the House, and representative government is a farce. I protest against it.

Sir, actions speak louder than words; and the action of the Republican party in the White House, in the Senate, and in this House of Representatives proves, if it proves anything, that the President and the Republican party are opposed to the Boers and in favor of Great Britain. I read in a New York newspaper the remarks of Mr. Webster Davis, made to a New York audience last night, in which he said that President McKinley is a patriot and a grand American and was opposed to the robbery and the murder Great Britain was carrying on in South Africa, and that the President would do his duty.

I challenge that statement. It is not in accordance with the facts and the record. In my judgment, it is absolutely inconsistent with the truth. The Administration is not patriotic; it is not American. On the contrary, it is doing all that it can to suppress the honest expression of opinion in this representative body regarding the war in South Africa. Nine-tenths of the American people are in sympathy with the Boers, and they want Congress to pass a resolution sympathizing with them in their heroic struggle, but the Administration refuses to permit Congress to express its opinion.

The Administration is doing all it can against the South African Republics. It is doing all it can in favor of Great Britain. If it were a patriotic Administration, if it were truly representative of American sentiment, it would have followed the precedents of a century and extended its sympathy long ago to the Boers. We sympathized with Poland, with Hungary, with Greece, with Armenia, with all the South American Republics, with Cuba. Many we helped. Why, I ask in the name of all these precedents, in the name of all our glorious past, do we refuse to sympathize with the Boers?

Is it because England dominates the McKinley Administration? Is it because the Republican party has surrendered American rights to British interests? Is it because, officially, American sentiment is dead? This morning when the Speaker told me that he would not recognize me, that he would not permit the consideration of the resolution I offered, what a spectacle he presented! I felt sorry for him. No doubt he was simply obeying his orders from the White House or from MARK HANNA; but it is a spectacle that should make every friend of representative government blush with shame.

Just a word more. In my judgment Congress should act. Now is the time to do something. America should do its duty and do it at once. We must not wait. We should respond to the overwhelming sentiment of the country and pass a resolution extending our sympathy to our two brave little sister Republics of South Africa. The Boer peace commissioners are on the way here, and if we did this now we would not only be doing our duty, but what a grand welcome the news would be to them, and how it would enthuse and encourage their struggling compatriots in South Africa. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

4441

O

TRUSTS.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1900.



WASHINGTON.
1900.

S P E E C H

—OF—

HON. WILLIAM SULZER

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In my judgment the trust question is one of the most important issues in American politics. The Democratic party is right on this question and against the trusts, and the Republican party is wrong on the issue and in favor of the trusts.

The Republican party is insincere in the position it now assumes for party purposes and political advantage. The present attitude of the Republican party on the trust issue, like its past, is too flimsy and too transparent to deceive anyone. The Republican party has been in power for nearly four years and it has done nothing against the trusts.

The Republican Attorney-General, clothed with ample power, has failed and refused to prosecute the trusts and monopolies. Why did he not enforce the law now on the statute books?

The law now on the statute books against trusts is clear and plain, and the highest court in the land has passed on its validity and sustained the constitutionality of its provisions. The anti-trust

act of 1890 declares that every contract or combination in the nature of a trust in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States and Territories or with foreign nations is a conspiracy, illegal and void, and punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Under this anti-trust act it seems to me every trust in the United States can be prosecuted for violation of law, the charter annulled, and the men behind it punished for conspiracy. Every trust by its very nature is in restraint of trade and commerce and in violation of this law.

If you will read the anti-trust act of 1890 and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the trans-Mississippi freight case, the Addyston Pipe Line case and the National Securities case the conclusion will be irresistible to the logical mind that the fault is not so much with the law as it is with the men who are sworn to enforce the law.

The law, so far as it goes, is all right—the do-nothing Attorney-General is all wrong. The imperative mandate of the

day is, "Enforce the law and every trust in the country will dissolve." Whenever the trusts have been brought before the courts and their true character shown, they have been declared illegal.

In my opinion—and I say so advisedly—the Department of Justice, under the present law, can institute and successfully maintain actions against every trust doing business in the United States. The law is clear and plain, and the facts are within the knowledge of all and too obvious for controversy.

It has been said by some unthinking persons that there are good trusts and bad trusts; that we should applaud and commend the good trusts and denounce and condemn the bad trusts.

Under the law this specious argument is untenable, and the men who make it are the hired attorneys and the special pleaders for the trusts, or they are facetious fellows poking fun at the victims.

Under the law of our country trusts are criminal, and there is no distinction between a so-called good trust and a so-called bad trust—between a big trust and a little trust. Every trust is contrary to both the spirit and the letter of the law. To seriously contend otherwise as a legal proposition would be preposterous. If we did so, by analogy, we might as consistently assert that there were good pirates and bad pirates. If robbery is criminal, it is immaterial, so far as the crime is concerned, whether the robbery is a big one or a little one. The violation of law is the same.

Under the last Democratic Administration there were a number of suits instituted against trusts by the Democratic Attorney-General, and carried to a successful determination. If you say the anti-trust act is not effective against trusts and monopolies in restraint of trade between the States and Territories, I point to the decision of the United States Su-

preme Court in the Addyston Pipe Line case and the Trans-Missouri freight case.

Those two decisions demonstrate conclusively that if the Republican Attorney-General had done his sworn duty most of the great trusts which have been organized since the Republican party has been in control of the Government would not now be robbing the people, but would be out of business.

You pretend now for political purposes that you are against trusts. Do you suppose anybody believes it? Do you suppose that you can humbug the people in regard to your position on trusts? You know and I know, and every other intelligent man in this country knows, that the Republican party is owned and controlled by the trusts.

Right here I want to say that I am now, always have been, and always will be unalterably opposed to trusts, monopolies, and combinations. Every since I have been in Congress I have been fighting trusts, but if I had my way now, you would not fool the people with this kind of cheap-John trust politics.

To-day about two hundred trusts control, wholly or in large part, every conceivable product and industry of the country.

These gigantic conspiracies and combinations called trusts constitute, in my judgment, the greatest and the gravest menace at the present time to our democratic institutions. They control the supply, monopolize the product, and dictate the price of almost every necessary of life. They force out of legitimate employment every year thousands and thousands of honest toilers. They limit production, enhance prices, reduce wages, and arbitrarily write the terms of their own contracts.

They destroy successful competition, paralyze honest industry, assassinate struggling labor, and hold the consumers

of our country in their monopolistic grasp. They levy tribute, like robber barons of old, on every man, woman, and child in the Republic. They blight the poor man's home, darken the hearthside of his children, cloud the star of youth's legitimate hope, and destroy equal opportunity. They control State and national legislation, escape taxation, and evade the just burdens of the Government, while their agents construct and maintain tariffs to suit their selfish ends and greedy purposes. They imperil traffic, stagnate trade, regulate foreign and interstate commerce, declare quarterly dividends on watered stock, and make fortunes every year by robbing the people.

Their tyrannical power, rapid growth, and centralization of wealth is the marvel of recent times and the saddest commentary the future historian will make on our legislative history. They practically own, run, and control the Government, and defy prosecution for violation of law. If their power of concentration and centralization is not speedily checked, and they go on for another quarter of a century like they have in the past few years, I believe our free institutions will be destroyed, and instead of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, we will have a government of the trusts, by the trusts, and for the trusts.

How much longer will the people consent to be robbed and submissively permit a continuation of this outrage? The trusts have their being and grow by special legislation; they live and wax fat by governmental favoritism.

All legislation bestowing special benefits on the few is unjust and against the masses and for the classes. It has gone on until less than 8 per cent of the people

own more than two-thirds of all the wealth of our country. It has been truly said that monarchies are destroyed by poverty and republics by wealth. If the greatest republic the world has ever seen is destroyed, it will fall by this vicious system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few.

The total population of the United States is about 80,000,000. The total aggregate wealth of the United States, according to the best statistics that can be procured, is estimated at about \$80,000,000,000, and it appears, and no doubt much to the surprise of many, that out of a total population of 80,000,000 less than 25,000 persons in the United States own more than one-half of the entire aggregate wealth of the land. And this has all been brought about during the last twenty-five years by combinations and conspiracies called trusts fostered by special legislation and nurtured by political favoritism.

The centralization of wealth in the hands of the few by the robbery of the many during the past quarter of a century has been simply enormous and the facts and figures are appalling. Three-quarters of the entire wealth of our land appears to be concentrated in the hands of a very small minority of the people, and the number of persons constituting the minority grows smaller and smaller every year. Impartial students of these startling facts and statistics can hardly escape the irresistible conclusion that a conspiracy exists, and has existed for some time, to convert the Government of the United States into a powerful oligarchy of wealth consisting of a few thousand multi-millionaires who will own and control all the other people.

"In my judgment, no man in this country ought to be compelled to work more than eight hours a day."

(From speech in favor of Eight-Hour Bill.)

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECHES

...OF...

WM. SULZER

Member of Congress from New York City, in the House
of Representatives during the 54th, 55th
56th and 57th Congresses.

Compiled from the Congressional Record.

"I stand for the rights of the toilers, and will do all in my power to advance their interests."

(From speech in favor of Labor Arbitration Bill.)



THE RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF.

The Record Shows Mr. Sulzer is Opposed to Trusts, Monopolies and Plutocracy.

* * * * *

"To-day the great trusts of the country are practically supreme. Many of them are so intrenched in power that they are to all intents and purposes above the law and no longer amenable to legislative action. The crying evil of the times is the power and the sway of the trusts. They endanger not only our free institutions but our free men. The battle cry of the Democratic party should be, 'The trusts must go!'

"To-day about 200 trusts control, wholly, or in large part, every conceivable product and industry of the country.

"These gigantic combinations constitute, in my judgment, the greatest menace at the present time to our democratic institutions. They control the supply, monopolize the product, and dictate the price of every necessary of life. They force out of legitimate employment thousands upon thousands of honest toilers. They enhance prices, reduce wages, and write the terms of their own contracts. They destroy competition, paralyze opportunity, assassinate labor, and hold the consumers of our country in their monopolistic grasp. They levy tribute on every man, woman and child in the Republic. They blight the poor man's home, darken the hearthside of his children, cloud the star of legitimate hope, and destroy equal opportunity. They control legislation, escape taxation, and evade the just burdens of government, while their agents construct and maintain tariffs to suit their selfish ends and greedy purposes. They imperil trade, stagnate industry, regulate foreign and interstate commerce, declare quarterly dividends on watered stocks and make fortunes every year out of the people. Their tyrannical power, rapid growth, and centralization of wealth are the marvel of recent times and the saddest commentary on our legislative history. Prior to the Civil War there was not a trust in the country, except the United States Bank trust, which Jackson killed.

"They practically own, run and control the Government to-day, and defy successful prosecution for violation of law. If their power of centralization is not speedily checked, and they go on for another quarter of a century like they have in the past few years, I believe our free institutions will be destroyed, and instead of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, we will have a government of the trusts, by the trusts, and for the trusts."—From the Congressional Record June 5, 1900.

* * * * *

He Favors Electing United States Senators by a Direct Vote of the People.

"The right to elect United States Senators by a direct vote of the people is a step in advance and in the right direction. I hope it will speedily be brought about. It is the right kind of reform, and I hope it will be succeeded by others, until this Government becomes indeed the greatest, the best, and the freest government the world has ever seen, where the will of the people shall be the supreme law of the land.

* * * * *

"I favor this change in the Constitution, as I shall every other that will restore the Government to the control of the people. I want the people, in fact as well as in theory, to rule this great republic and the Government to be directly responsible and immediately responsive to their will. And in this way, as Abraham Lincoln said, will the republic live and the Government of the people never perish from the earth."

* * * * *

"I am opposed to delegating away the rights of the people, and where they have been delegated I would restore them to the people."

"I am a Democrat of the Jefferson school. I trust the people, and I believe in the people. I believe with him that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. In this matter under discussion I want to restore to the people the right now delegated to the legislatures by the framers of the Constitution, so that the Senate as well as this House will be directly responsible to the people, and the Government become more and more a pure democracy, where brains, fitness, honesty, ability, experience, and capacity, and not wealth alone, shall be the true qualifications for the upper branch of the Federal Legislature."

* * * * *

"In my judgment the people can and ought to be trusted. If the people cannot be trusted, then free government is a failure and our institutions are doomed."

* * * * *

See Congressional Record 55th Congress, 2d Session.

* * * * *

Mr. Sulzer is Now, Always Has Been, and Always Will Be, the Friend of the Wage Earners.

From speech in favor of the Eight Hour Law.

* * * * *

"In my judgment, no man in this country ought to be compelled to work more than eight hours a day."

* * * * *

"We want fewer idle men and more work in this country."

* * * * *

"I want to say that I am a friend of the wage-earner. I want to see, and I hope the day is not far distant when we all shall see, an eight-hour law all over the land and rigidly enforced in every State, every city, every town, and every village in the country. I believe it will be beneficial to the laborer, advantageous to the community in which he lives, and for the best interest of the Government. Too long hours make the wage-earner a poor workman. Shorter hours, in my opinion, will produce better results."

* * * * *

"I am and always have been an advocate of shorter hours for a legal-working day. The history of the past teaches us that every reduction in the hours constituting a day's work has resulted beneficially."

* * * * *

"These reductions in the hours of labor have decreased intemperance, increased knowledge, made better homes, happier and better clothed wives and children, brighter and more prosperous firesides, and in every way benefitted the social relations, promoted happiness and contentment, and improved the moral, economical, and financial condition of the producing masses of our land."

* * * * *

See Congressional Record, 55th Congress, 2d Session.

* * * * *

Mr. Sulzer on Taxation.

"Protection has nothing to do with the price of labor. Capital buys labor as cheaply as it can. Wages are regulated by the inexorable law of supply and demand."

Whenever you find two employers looking for one workman wages will be high, and whenever you find two workmen looking for one employer wages will be low."

* * * * *

"The Democratic party stands for a fair, just, and equitable revenue system, a tariff for revenue that will support the Government, economically administered, with equal justice to all and favoritism to none, having a jealous care for our farmers and toilers."

* * * * *

See Congressional Record, 54th Congress, 2d Session.

* * * * *

Mr. Sulzer Against Special Legislation.

"We should legislate for the best interests of the whole country, and not for the interests of any one section of the country, or for the advantage of the trusts, the monopolies, the syndicates, and the manufacturers."

* * * * *

From speech in Congress, March 31, 1897. See Record of Congress.

Mr. Sulzer Stands for the People.

* * * * *

"In the conflict which is now on I want to see the people win and the Government of the republic restored to them, to be wisely, honestly, and economically administered, not for the advantage of the few, but for the benefit of all."

* * * * *

See Record 55th Congress, 2d Session.

* * * * *

"The centralization of wealth in the hands of the few by the robbery of the many during the past quarter of a century has been simply enormous, and the facts and figures are appalling. Three-quarters of the entire wealth of our land appears to be concentrated in the hands of a very small minority of the people, and the number of persons constituting that minority grows smaller and smaller every year. The legislative schemes which have been most favored for checking this growing centralization of wealth are generally the most delusive and the most impotent.

* * * * *

From speech in Congress, February 18, 1898.

* * * * *

Mr. Sulzer Sounds a Note of Warning.

"My sympathies are all with the poor, the oppressed, and the unfortunate. My heart goes out to those who toil and struggle and fail. I know in the long race of life's tempestuous battle only the few win, that the many lose heart, become discouraged, and give up the fight in hopeless despair."

* * * * *

From speech in Congress, February 18, 1898.

He Speaks for the Volunteers.

* * * * *

"I believe in the citizen soldiery of our land. I take a deep interest in their welfare, and in so far as I can I shall always maintain their rights. The history of our country in time of war demonstrates that there are no better soldiers. They are brave, patriotic and intelligent. They come from the professions, from the workshops, from the counting rooms, from the mills, from the mines, and from the fields. There are no better fighters than those who come from the volunteer forces of the people. These volunteers constitute the great patriotic army of our country. They are no hirelings, no mercenaries; they fight for the defense of home and country, for principle and glory, for liberty and the rights of man. In time of peace, they follow their usual trades, professions and occupations. They do not menace our liberties or the stability of our free institutions. In time of war they constitute an army of intelligent, well-drilled soldiers as large as any army in the world. In a republic like ours a great standing army in time of peace is useless, expensive and dangerous. In time of trouble we should and we must rely upon the volunteer forces of the country." * * *

* * * * *

From speech on Volunteers in House of Representatives, April 7, 1898.

* * * * *

Opposed to the Banking Trust.

"I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing precisely to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly. We should resist the encroachments of national banks on the liberties of the people with the same zeal and the same courage that Andrew Jackson resisted the audacious claims of the United States Bank in his day. And when the national banks impudently declare that the Government should go out of the banking business, we should answer that the banks should and must go out of the governing business.

"In Jackson's day there was only one Nick Biddle. To-day there is a Nick Biddle in every national bank in the land.

* * * * *

See Congressional Record, June 5, 1900.

* * * * *

The Record Shows Mr. Sulzer is the Friend of the Plain People, and Stands for Equal Rights to All, Special Privileges to None.

From speech in favor of Labor Arbitration Bill.

* * * * *

"I shall vote for any bill that will, in my judgment, benefit, as I believe this bill will, the labor organizations throughout the United States.

"The labor organizations represented here by their delegates favor this bill and want it to pass. I am guided largely by their wishes, for I have always found them honest, intelligent, fearless, and efficient.

"I believe they know what they want, and I think we should accede to their wishes in this matter. They hope and believe this bill will do some good."

"There is one thing this bill does that I like, and that is, it recognizes by law for the first time, I believe, organized labor and its rights."

* * * * *

"Let me say, what many of you know, that I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of organized labor. I stand for the rights of the toilers, the workers and the masses, and in my humble way will always do all in my power to advance their interests and protect their privileges."

* * * * *

"If you really want to do something for the working people in this country, why do you not take up and pass the labor-commission bill, the eight-hour law, the bill to tax out of existence the sweating shops, the bill to prevent prison-made goods from being sold outside of the State in which they are made, and several other bills demanded by organized labor all over the country and really in their interest and for their benefit?"

* * * * *

See Congressional Record, 55th Congress, 3d Session.

* * * * *

A Friend of the Letter Carriers.

* * * * *

"How poorly, how miserably the letter carriers are paid! Under the present law they do not, and can not, earn enough, no matter how long they have been in the service of the Government or how many hours a day they labor, to keep body and soul together. And what do they get? A mere pittance a month that is not enough to economically support one man. It is a disgrace, a crying shame. Many of these letter carriers have wives and children—little homes—and these wives and children in many cases are to-day in want.

* * * * *

"These men are the most efficient, the hardest worked in all the country's service, and the poorest paid. The letter carriers of the land are compelled to toil day in and day out—in sunshine and in storm, in winter and in summer, in all kinds of weather—sometimes eighteen hours out of the twenty-four, and taking all other employees in the various departments of the Federal Government as a basis for comparison, it can not be denied that the letter carriers render the most and the hardest work for the smallest remuneration. Let us be just to these honest, hard-working faithful men."

* * * * *

See Congressional Record, February 19, 1902.

* * * * *

Compelled the Continued Lighting of Liberty Light.

* * * * *

"On the 1st day of March, this year, by order of the Light-House Board, Liberty light, on Bedloe's Island, in the Harbor of New York, was extinguished. Just why the Light-House Board issued that order I know not, and no one whom I have talked to about it has been able to give to me a satisfactory explanation. In my opinion there is no good reason for that order. The light from Liberty's torch should not be put out. It is essential to commerce, but more than that, it represents a patriotic sentiment that should never be extinguished.

"The great statue of Liberty Enlightening the World was unveiled on the 28th day of October, 1886. It was a splendid gift from the Republic of France to the Republic of the United States. It was intended to be a bond of sympathy, of fraternal feeling, of undying memories, of lasting friendship, of eternal good will between the two great Republics. It meant sympathy for republics and republican institutions all over the world. It glorified liberty, fortified freedom, and emphasized the rights of man. It was to be and it ever should be a great beacon light of democracy, dispelling the darkness of tyranny and welcoming to our hospitable shores the oppressed of every land. It was Bartholdi's apotheosis of liberty; a gift from the greatest Republic in Europe to the greatest Republic in all the world.

"Its light should shine for all the ages. It should never go out while liberty lives in the breast of man. It links the past with the present, and should be prophetic of the future."

* * * * *

See Congressional Record, April 1, 1902.

* * * * *

He Favors the Republic—Against Empire.

* * * * *

"In the contest which is now on between the Republic and the empire, I take my stand with the people against empire and in favor of the perpetuity of the Republic. Ours is the great republic, the beacon light of the world, the refuge of the oppressed of every clime, the home for the downtrodden of every land, and it is incumbent and a sacred and imperative duty on those who are here and enjoying the inestimable blessings of our free institutions to see to it that the Government of Jefferson, of Jackson, and of Lincoln does not perish from the earth."

* * * * *

See Congressional Record, February 23, 1900.

* * * * *

Always the Friend of Cuba.

* * * * *

"Let me reiterate what I have frequently said before on this floor, that I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of Cuba and of the Cubans. The record will show that ever since I have been a member of this House I have done all in my power for the Cuban people. I am glad the bright day is not far distant when the Cuban republic will take her place among the nations of the earth. May success, happiness, prosperity, and domestic tranquility abide with her hereafter forever, is my fervent prayer.

"The time is at hand, nevertheless, when we must live up to our sacred obligations to Cuba. We must grant her the freedom and the independence promised. We must launch this young republic of Cuba on the ocean of nations and say to all the world, Cuba is free and independent. We must say to every nation, She is our

creation—a daughter of the great republic—and any interference with her will be an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States.

“But that is not all. We must now grant her immediate trade relief. In a commercial way she is at our mercy. That is not her fault—it is our fault. Congress has made it practically impossible for Cuba to market her products in other countries; they must be sold here, and they cannot be sold in this country at present except at a ruinous loss, unless our tariff law is repealed or modified. This must be done at once—it should have been done months ago. If it is not speedily done I predict that conditions in Cuba will soon be worse than they ever were before. The situation is serious and admits of no further delay. The people want Congress to act.

“The Republican party is responsible for the deplorable commercial condition now existing in Cuba. The Republican party, wedded to its high protective-tariff policy, would apparently rather witness the starvation of the Cubans than consent to reduce to a slight degree for Cuba its present system of outrageous tariff taxes. What a spectacle of commercial selfishness, monopolistic greed, and political shortsightedness the Republican party presents to-day! We have been in session here since the first Monday of last December, and nothing has been done to afford relief to the Cubans.

* * * * *

See Congressional Record, March 27, 1902.

* * * *

The Record tells the Story.

EULOGY
OF
HON. WM. SULZER, OF NEW YORK,
ON THE
LIFE, CHARACTER, AND PUBLIC SERVICES
OF THE LATE
HON. WM. D. DALY, OF NEW JERSEY,
IN THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
FEBRUARY 9, 1901.

The House having adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM D. DALY, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended that opportunity may be given for fitting tribute to his memory.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate, and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, do adjourn—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: On this sad occasion I desire to place on record my sincere and humble tribute to the memory of my friend and colleague, the late WILLIAM D. DALY, and in this connection to say a few simple, honest words regarding his life, his character, and his public services.

It was my good fortune to know Judge DALY well and intimately for years. We were great personal friends, and I admired and respected him as a man and a friend. His sudden, tragic, and unexpected death on the 31st day of last July was a grievous blow to us all and a terrible shock to his family, his relatives, his friends, and to the country generally. It was entirely unlooked for and came like a thunderbolt from a clear sky. It darkened a happy home, prostrated a loving family, distressed innumerable friends, and cast a pall of sadness over his native State which has not yet been dissipated. He died in the prime of life, at the summit of his remarkable career, in the zenith of his well-earned fame, loved and mourned by all who knew him and appreciated his worth.

Life is but a day, at most,
Sprung from night, in darkness lost.

WILLIAM D. DALY was born in Jersey City, N. J., on the 4th day of June, 1851, and had he lived until his next natal day

would have been just 50 years of age. During all his life he ever remained a resident of his native State, and when he died he was one of her most popular and distinguished citizens and had the honor to represent the city of his birth in the people's branch of the American Congress.

Mr. DALY began life as a poor boy, and was the architect of his own career. He began with many disadvantages, but surmounted them all. He had vim, grit, hope, and perseverance. He plodded on and progressed by his own indomitable will and force of character. He never faltered, and won where others lost. He did not know the meaning of defeat. In the bright lexicon of his life there was no such word as fail. His whole life was a brilliant series of successes.

He was eminently a self-made man. He was a child of the Republic. He was a product of the public schools, but at a very early age he left school and began life's tempestuous battle as an apprentice in an iron foundry. Here, in his early boyhood days, he made many friends, who ever after were his trusted and loyal supporters. His work, however, in the iron foundry was uncongenial. His active mind and restless ambition soared higher. He wanted to be somebody. He sighed for a broader field of activity. He believed in himself, in his own ability, in his future, in his star of hope. He longed to be a lawyer, and believed the legal profession offered an attractive avenue for his hopes, his usefulness, and his best endeavors. He left the iron foundry, entered a law office, and threw his very life and soul into the study of Blackstone and Chitty, Kent and Story, Parsons and Washburn, and the other legal text-books. He was an indefatigable worker, a tireless student. He burned the midnight oil.

He mastered the intricacies of the law, and on reaching his majority was admitted to the bar and quickly made a splendid reputation as one of the most learned and best equipped lawyers in his State. He had eloquence and tact, patience and confidence, energy and industry. He studied his cases carefully and knew all the law and all the facts of every case intrusted to his care. He made his client's cause his own, and never went into court unprepared. He did not rely on luck or trust to chance. He knew a case well prepared is a case half won. He never took advantage of a client, never deceived the court, and had a magnificent reputation in his profession for fairness, probity, and honor. He was identified with some of the great trials in New Jersey, practiced in all the courts, was one of the great leaders of the bar, had represented, it is said, the defense in more capital cases than any other lawyer of his time, and ere his death he stood in the front rank of his chosen profession—a brilliant advocate and a safe counselor, learned in the law.

In recognition of his position at the bar, and in appreciation of his unquestioned legal ability, President Cleveland, during his first term, appointed Mr. DALY assistant United States district attorney, the arduous duties of which office he faithfully discharged, with much credit to himself and to the satisfaction of the Government and the people.

But, sir, it was not in the law alone where Mr. DALY excelled. He had always been a close student of public affairs, and had ever taken an active part in all political discussions. He was an ardent Democrat of the Jefferson and Jackson school, and thoroughly

familiar with the political history of our country. During the last two decades of his life he had been a delegate to nearly all the local, State, and national conventions, and on account of his sagacity and political acumen his advice was always sought and his judgment generally followed by his political associates.

He was a magnetic campaign speaker, had a charming personality, and an earnest, sincere, honest way of presenting his facts that arrested attention and carried conviction. In every State and national campaign his services were always in demand and the work he performed duly appreciated by the managers and candidates of his party. Hence it is not a matter of wonder that his fellow-citizens elected him over and over again to the legislature of his State and took a just pride in his political preferment.

He was first elected to the assembly of his State in 1889 to represent the Eighth district of Hudson County, and although a new member, his party colleagues elected him unanimously as their leader on the floor. Events amply justified their confidence and their judgment. He made such a brilliant record that at the close of his term Governor Leon Abbett nominated him for judge of the district court of Hoboken, and the senate unanimously confirmed him. As judge he gave further evidence of his knowledge of the law. He was always impartial, courteous, patient, and humane, and became the idol of the bar and the ideal judge to the people.

In the year 1892 the people nominated him for State senator, and Judge DALY reluctantly resigned the judgeship to accept. He was triumphantly elected, and reelected in 1895. He made a splendid record in the legislature for industry, ability, and integrity, and during the last five years of his senatorial career was the leader of his party in the senate by the unanimous choice of his party colleagues.

He came very near being nominated for governor of New Jersey in 1898, and if he had been nominated it is believed by those who claim to know that he would have been elected beyond a doubt. Failing to receive the nomination for governor, the people insisted that he should represent them in Congress. He was unanimously nominated for Representative in Congress for the Seventh New Jersey district, the district in which he was born, and on election day was triumphantly elected by the largest majority ever given a candidate in that district.

As a member of Congress, Judge DALY took a prominent part in all the great debates, and by his industry and ability, together with his courteous manner and genial way, soon won the respect and admiration of all his colleagues. When he passed away, on the very threshold of his Congressional life, he was making an enviable record for usefulness here, not only for the benefit of his constituents, but for the good of the whole country. We have missed him much this session, and as the days come and go we who knew him well will miss him more and more. The work he did for the people will live in the history of his State and of his country. That great work will grow brighter and brighter as the years pass by until it becomes his lasting monument, more endurable than marble or brass, and sacred in the hearts of his grateful countrymen.

We mourn and sympathize with his beloved family, but can find no words of comfort, no consolation, save in his noble life, his generous character, his sympathetic nature, and the great

work he accomplished for humanity. His deeds of kindness, of charity, and of generosity will ever keep alive his memory and call to recollection his name a thousand times a day.

The memory of good deeds will ever stay
A lamp to light us on the darkened way,
A music to the ear on clamoring street,
A cooling well amid the noonday heat,
A scent of green boughs blown through narrow walls,
A feel of rest when quiet evening falls.

Senator DALY was a true man, a lover of justice, a believer in the supremacy of law, a friend of every cause that lacked assistance. He stood for eternal principles of right, for fair play, and believed in the opportunity vouchsafed to everyone under the dome of the Union sky. He was an optimist and not a pessimist. He was no skeptic, no scoffer, no cynic. He was broad and liberal in his views, had charity for all, trusted the people, and never lost faith in humanity. He knew the world was growing better. He knew himself, believed in the destiny of the Republic, and made the corner stone of his political convictions that great cardinal principle—equal rights to all. special privileges to no one.

He hated cant, spurned pretense, and despised hypocrisy. He had no use for a trickster, a trimmer, or a trader. He had a sunshiny, genial disposition, and a forgiving spirit that never harbored revenge. He was a plain, simple man who loved mankind. He was an indulgent father, a kind and loving husband, and a faithful friend. He will live in the hearts of those he left behind, and to do this is not to die. He was an indefatigable worker and succeeded in accomplishing what he undertook to do. He met Napoleon's test—he did things. He was a true Democrat, the implacable foe of private monopoly, of unjust taxation, of organized greed, of discriminating legislation that robs the many for the benefit of the few, of special privilege, and he made the Constitution our great magna charta—the north star of his political life. He was the true friend of the toiler, the fearless champion of the oppressed, and the eloquent advocate of the downtrodden. He tried to lift his fellow-man up to a higher plane and help him forward on the highway of progress and civilization. He was a fearless man, and ever dared to do what he thought was right regardless of consequences. He was a faithful public official, and died in the service of his country. His work here is done. His career on earth is finished. He has run his course; he has kept the faith: he has fought the good fight: he has reaped his everlasting reward in the great beyond, and we, his friends, can all say truthfully, well done thou good and faithful servant, a grateful people will ever keep thy memory green.

In halls of state he stood for many years
Like fabled knight, his visage all aglow,
Receiving, giving sternly, blow for blow,
Champion of right! But from eternity's far shore
Thy spirit will return to join the strife no more.
Rest citizen, statesman, rest; thy troubled life is o'er.

SPEECHES
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF
NEW YORK,
ON
MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS.

2d SESSION, 56th CONGRESS,
DECEMBER 15, 1900, AND FEBRUARY 28, MARCH 1, 2, AND 3, 1901.

WASHINGTON.
1901.

The Philippines and Cuba—Let Us Be Honest.

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM SULZER, OF NEW YORK, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *Friday, March 1, 1901,*

On the following resolution:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14017) making appropriations for the Army and without intervening motion to move to concur in the Senate amendments thereto in gross; after two hours' debate (one hour on each side) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on said motion, and a vote then be had thereon without delay or intervening motion."

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The adoption of the rule just offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] by the vote of the Republicans in this House is, in my judgment, the greatest outrage on the rights of the Democratic minority ever perpetrated in the history of this legislative body. It seems the minority have no rights here that the ruthless Republican majority are bound to respect. The Democrats are to be gagged, legitimate debate shut off, our protests frustrated, our appeals for justice denied, the rights of humanity trampled on; while the Republicans, intoxicated with power, ride roughshod over our rules, the Constitution, and the sacred guaranties of the Republic. The House of Representatives has ceased to be a deliberative body. It is the mere creature of one man. Let me read the rule prepared and just adopted by the Republicans to force through this House the pernicious and iniquitous legislation against Cuba and the Philippines:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14017) making appropriations for the Army and without intervening motion to move to concur in the Senate amendments thereto in gross; after two hours' debate (one hour on each side) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on said motion, and a vote then be had thereon without delay or intervening motion.

The adoption of that unjust rule is in violation of the letter and the spirit of the rules of this House. As a member of the minority of this House, I enter my most emphatic protest against it and the outrage its adoption will speedily consummate. We should have at least a week to debate this matter.

What is the purpose of this arbitrary action? What dark deed is to be enacted by virtue of its adoption? Several weeks ago this House passed the Army appropriation bill and sent it to the Senate. By some inscrutable legislative legerdemain the Republicans in the Senate placed on this Army appropriation bill two amendments or riders—one affecting Cuba and the other in regard

to the Philippines. Let us see what these two amendments are. Let us examine these two un-American and outrageous riders. The first amendment or rider relates to Cuba, and reads as follows, viz:

That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled, "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

I.

That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

II.

That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

III.

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

IV.

That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

V.

That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

VI.

That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

VII.

That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

VIII.

That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

The second amendment, or rider, relates to the Philippines and reads as follows, viz:

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion: *Provided*, That all franchises granted

under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal the same.

Until a permanent government shall have been established in said archipelago full reports shall be made to Congress on or before the first day of each regular session of all legislative acts and proceedings of the temporary government instituted under the provisions hereof; and full reports of the acts and doings of said government, and as to the condition of the archipelago and of its people, shall be made to the President, including all information which may be useful to the Congress in providing for a more permanent government: *Provided*, That no sale or lease or other disposition of the public lands or the timber thereon or the mining rights therein shall be made: *And provided further*, That no franchise shall be granted which is not approved by the President of the United States, and is not in his judgment clearly necessary for the immediate government of the islands and indispensable for the interest of the people thereof, and which can not, without great public mischief, be postponed until the establishment of permanent civil government; and all such franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of such permanent civil government.

Mr. Speaker, the far-reaching importance of these two riders, hastily put on an appropriation bill in the Senate, in violation of all precedent, is beyond calculation. They go to the very foundation of our Government. They place in the hands of the President unlimited, despotic, and autocratic power. They define and fix an arbitrary procedure and policy that may, and, in my opinion, will, cause endless trouble, enormous expense, and innumerable lives. They hazard interminable war. They present the most important question for wise, just, and deliberate solution and determination that has confronted the American Congress since the civil strife, and we are compelled to vote on them by the adoption of a partisan rule for political purposes, after a meager debate of only two hours—one hour on each side.

If the matter under consideration were not so serious, affecting as it does the lives, the liberties, the property, and the happiness of millions and millions of people under tropic suns, in the Occident and in the Orient—the attitude, the programme, and the procedure of the Republicans would be as absurd as it is Quixotic. This is a most momentous question, and we should have time to deliberate and the right to propose amendments. Under the rule we have neither. The Democratic members are cut off from their rights. They have no choice; no opportunity to give expression to their views. Perhaps we should be thankful that we can yet vote, and let the people of the country know that the Democratic representatives in Congress are to a man opposed to this infamy.

These two vicious riders, that will destroy every vestige of freedom in Cuba and every hope of liberty in the Philippines, were put on the Army bill in the Senate. They were put on in violation of all parliamentary procedure. They could not have been adopted in the first instance in this House. It has been said they were put on in the Senate by some understanding, some trade, some unholy bargain, between the alleged friends of liberty and the imperialistic opponents of freedom, in order to pass other bills and avoid an extra session of Congress. Be this as it may, I know not, although appearances are sometimes quite convincing; but we all know these riders, to trample in the dust in Cuba and the Philippines justice, liberty, and humanity, would never be here if the Democratic Senators had wanted to defeat them. They never could have been adopted in the Senate without the acquiescence of the Democrats there. They are responsible for this situation.

These riders are most despotic, most iniquitous, most unjust, and most inhuman. They portray in burning letters the sordid, greedy, and corrupt spirit of commercialism, which destroys our

highest ideals, makes us ashamed of our past, and compels us to bow our heads in humiliation as we witness the present and contemplate the future of our country. They make our great Republic despicable and a byword of reproach. They reveal and unmask the cruel, sordid, treacherous policy of the Administration, and expose to full view the hypocrisy, the perfidy, and the infamy of the Republican party. I am opposed to these riders. They will never pass with my consent or my vote. If Congress enacts them into law, the President will be the most powerful, the most despotic, and the most autocratic potentate on earth. I am opposed to delegating the powers of Congress to the President. If these gradual surrenders of vested constitutional rights and transfers of legislative powers to the Executive continue, the day, in my judgment, is not far distant when we shall cease to be a representative government responsible to the people.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has said that the provision regarding the Philippines is similar to the resolution enacted by Congress in regard to the temporary government of the Louisiana purchase. I beg to differ with the gentleman. He is sadly in error. To conclusively show the wide and startling difference let me read the act of 1803 regarding the temporary government of Jefferson's Louisiana purchase:

Until the expiration of the present session of Congress, or unless provision be sooner made for the temporary government of the said territories, all the military, civil, and judicial powers exercised by the officers of the existing government of the same shall be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of Louisiana in the full enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Compare the two. There is no analogy between them. A casual reading of the two acts is sufficient. One is "until the expiration of the present session of Congress." The other is indefinite, and for all desired and practical purposes surrenders absolute and complete power to the President. The Philippine provision in this bill and the act of 1803, relating to the temporary government of Louisiana, are as far apart as the poles. And I say now that if the Republicans are sincere in their present contention they will permit the Democrats to offer as an amendment for the provision under discussion affecting the Philippines a substitute similar to the enactment of 1803 relating to Louisiana. If the other side will permit us to do that, I know and I declare that every Democrat on this side of the House will cheerfully vote for it. I challenge the majority to allow us to do it. Your refusal is an evidence of the insincerity and hypocrisy of your pretensions, and another demonstration of the imperialistic policy of force of the Republican party.

Let me, sir, say again what I have frequently said before on the floor of this House, that I am now, always have been, and always will be, opposed to the cruel, the inhuman, the ruthless, the un-American, and the unchristian conduct of this Administration to the struggling Filipinos, whose only crime is the love of liberty, their hope for freedom, and their aspiration for independence. If we had been true to ourselves, and to the great ideals of American manhood, patriotism, and statesmanship, not a drop of American blood would have been shed in the Philippine Archipelago. Sordid greed has cost us hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, and cruel lust for power thousands and thousands of precious lives. And the end is not yet.

How long will this costly war of extermination and subjugation last? Can anyone tell? Will it be the black page of Spain's history over again? I pray not. Sooner than see the Republic destroyed, and the Philippine Islands the tomb of the flower and the youth of America, I would do what I believe Abraham Lincoln would do if he were at the head of the Government to-day—help the Filipinos establish a stable government of their own, a republic fashioned after this Republic, and then say to all the world, "Hands off; any interference with the Filipino republic will be an act unfriendly to the United States."

So much, sir, in regard to the adoption of this partisan, unjust, and arbitrary rule in order to choke off debate, and to my position on the amendment surrendering all legislative power to the President, to perform whatever his autocratic will and despotic purpose may suggest regarding the Philippine Islands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something in regard to the other amendment, or rider—the one relating to Cuba. I have been a friend of the Cuban patriots for years. When I first came to Congress, six years ago, I championed their cause in Congress and out of Congress, in season and out of season. I did all I could to help them throw off the tyrannous yoke of cruel and oppressive Spain. They were then waging a just war to secure their freedom and their independence. My sympathy was all with the Cuban patriots. I knew their oppression; I was familiar with all their suffering, with their long and heroic struggle for liberty and the right to govern themselves.

I introduced in this House the first resolution of sympathy for them, indulging the hope that they would succeed because their cause was just. I introduced in this House the first resolution granting them belligerent rights; the first resolution recognizing their independence, and the first resolution declaring war against Spain. When war was finally declared, I organized in the city of New York a regiment of soldiers and begged the Republican governor of New York, and also the President, to accept it and muster it into the service. They refused—presumably for political reasons. I was willing and anxious to resign my seat in this House to go to the front with my regiment and fight for Cuban independence, but could not get a chance, ostensibly because I was a Democrat. A perusal of the proceedings of this House before, during, and after the Spanish-American war will leave no one in doubt regarding my position on the Cuban question. I wanted to see Cuba free. In the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress I said:

My position is well known and unchangeable. Long, long ago I made up my mind. I have never deviated from the first stand I took. I want to see Cuba free. She must be free and independent. The Spaniard and his yellow flag—the emblem of atrocity—must go.

You know that in all the history of the world no people ever deserved the right of self-government more than the heroic, struggling Cuban patriots. For centuries they have been oppressed, robbed, starved, and murdered by a cruel foreign power. The tyranny of Spain, her refined butcheries, her fiendish brutalities, are the blackest pages in the annals of the world. * * *

What a sad story the history of poor Cuba tells! For more than three centuries Spain has ruled her with a blood-stained and an iron hand. It has been a thousand times worse than the rule of the Turk. It has been a thousand times worse than the rule of a barbaric military despotism over a conquered and subjected province.

The history of poor Cuba's trials, her woes, her troubles, and her tribulations never has been written and never will be written. Not half the truth will ever be known. And more the shame!

Spanish rule in Cuba has been one long, unending, hideous carnival of crime, of public plunder, of rapine, of official robbery, of murder, of starva-

tion, of destitution, of assassination, and of cruel, torturing death—a frightful, big black blot on the pages of civilization; a lasting, burning disgrace to all Christendom; an impudent, imperial challenge, backed by the bayonet, to the sober sense of humanity and the Christian civilization of the world.

And subsequently I said in the same Congress:

I stand now where I have always stood, where I will stand until the last—for the liberty-loving people of Cuba, who are making and have made as heroic and as gallant a battle for freedom and independence as any people ever made in the history of the world. I want to see them win, and I know they will win if this great Republic, which should stand as a shining light, as a beacon, and as an example for all the other republics of the world and for every people struggling for liberty and independence, will simply do its duty.

That, sir, in substance, was my position then in regard to Cuba. I was for Cuban independence then, and I am for Cuban independence now. I have not changed my views. Nothing has occurred since the signing of the treaty of peace in Paris to make me alter in any way my original opinions. On the contrary, much has happened to confirm and strengthen them. The record is made up. It speaks for itself. We should keep faith. We went to war with Spain to free Cuba, not to annex Cuba; not to free the Cubans from Spanish slavery in order to enforce American despotism. We declared our high moral purpose of intervention to be in the interest of civilization.

We patriotically proclaimed that the war was to be waged for liberty, for freedom, and for humanity, and called all the world to witness our noble intentions and our undying devotion to the fundamental tenets of the fathers as embodied in the immortal Declaration of Independence. As proof of this let me read and again put in the RECORD the resolution of Congress declaring war against Spain, approved by the President on the 20th day of April, 1898:

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited; Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

THOMAS B. REED,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
GARRET A. HOBART,
Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate.

Approved, April 20, 1898.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

There is nothing doubtful, nothing ambiguous, about that resolution. It pledged the sacred honor of the Government and the solemn word of our people to drive Spain from Cuba; declared that the Cubans are, and of right ought to be, free and independent; and disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island. The question now is, it seems to me, Shall we keep our word or break it? Shall we live up to our sacred promise or abjectly stultify ourselves in order that personal pelf may follow political perfidy?

Let us be honest. We must not forget. We should keep our word. We should fulfill the letter and the spirit of the promise. We should do our duty and give the Cubans absolute freedom and independence. There should be no conditions. Any different policy now, any deviation from our promise of three years ago, will be national dishonor and a stultification that must bring to the cheek of every honest American the blush of shame. Shall the plighted faith of the nation be kept? Americans, read that sinister Republican rider regarding Cuba, attached to this appropriation bill by the servile servants of commercialism in the Senate, in the light of our patriotic declaration of war, and answer! Its adoption here to-day means national dishonor, national repudiation, national shame, and national perfidy.

The vote here to-day, sir, will show that the Republican party has chosen to stand for disgrace and dishonor—for pelf and power; that the representatives of the Democratic party stand for liberty, for loyalty to the principles of the fathers, for freedom, for the fulfillment of the national promise, for the sacred rights of man, for peace and prosperity, for the Constitution, and, above and beyond all, for the traditions and the true glory and destiny of the Republic.

For mankind are one in spirit, and an instinct bears along,
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong.
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet Humanity's vast frame
Through its ocean-sundered fibers feels the gush of joy or shame;
In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim.

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light.

Post-Office Appropriation Bill.

February 28, 1901.

Mr. LOUD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I concur substantially in what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] has so well said. In my judgment it would be for the best interests of the great majority of the people of the United States if they had control, in connection with the post-offices and as a part of the Postal Department, of the telegraph and the telephone. I believe it would be in the interest of and a great saving to the people. I believe it would put an end to two great selfish monopolies, and would give the people of this country cheaper telephone rates and lower telegraph rates. I am unalterably opposed to all private monopolies. But more about this when I can get more time. Now, sir, in the

few minutes allowed me by the gentleman from California I want to enter my most emphatic protest regarding the unjust discrimination contained in this bill against the great city of New York.

For several years the post-office authorities of the city of New York have used the pneumatic-tube service. That service has been a great success, has facilitated the carrying and the distribution of the mails, and has given great satisfaction to the people. It has been a great convenience to the merchants, and every association of business men, the boards of trade, the chamber of commerce, and in fact all the various chambers of industry, have petitioned Congress to continue the pneumatic-tube service. I have filed many of the petitions and resolutions. This bill has eliminated this desirable service, and the merchants and citizens of the city of New York are to be deprived of the service and compelled to waste and lose from five to twelve hours in every twenty-four in receiving and transmitting their mail. I protest against this outrage—this failure to live up to implied obligations.

The city of New York has the greatest post-office in this country—a post-office which pays, over and above expenses, a revenue to the Government every year of over \$5,000,000. We have asked, and asked in vain, for a new post-office building in that city. We should have it. But this Congress will do nothing for New York City. The present old post-office building there is a disgrace and a menace to the health and lives of the people employed in the building. We must have a new post-office. We will get one, I trust, in the next Congress. But this pneumatic-tube service should not be discontinued. It should be now continued by an appropriation in this bill. I regret exceedingly that the Post-Office Committees of the House and the Senate, after adopting this service, propose now at this late day to discontinue it. It is wrong and a very shortsighted economical policy.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Does my friend know the cost to the Government for every mile of pneumatic-tube service laid down in New York City?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; I know. The figures are given in the report of the Post-Office Department; and with those figures before it, that Department recommended in the strongest terms the continuance of this service. In the hope of getting this relief I shall vote down this conference report.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Charleston, S. C., Exposition.

March 1, 1901.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old and a wise saying that consistency is a jewel. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has probably never heard that saying, if we are to judge by his actions, his votes, and his speeches. He has originated and passed some of the most lavish and extravagant appropriation bills.

He has advocated and voted for some of the most reckless and uncalled-for expenditures of the people's money. He has done as much as anyone on that side of the House to make this a billion

and a half dollar Congress, the most costly and expensive Congress in all the history of our country. When we compare his record with his professions, he is as disingenuous as he is inconsistent.

He is strenuously opposed now to this appropriation of \$250,000 for a Government exhibit and the necessary and incidental Government building at the Charleston Exposition. At the last moment—in the dying days of this Congress—he is awakened and rises up in patriotic indignation to sound the alarm, and in stentorian tones declare these appropriations must cease or the exchequer of the Government will be depleted. It seems to me the gentleman's good intentions are rather late, and should have been put in execution long ere this.

Sir, I am at least consistent. I am in favor of the exposition in Charleston, S. C., and I shall do all I can in my humble way to make it a success and an object lesson that will help the Southland and reflect credit on the whole country. I believe in these expositions of our progress, our industry, and our material resources.

I believe they do great good; that they are great object lessons to the people and great educators for the masses. The Government should participate in all of them and give what aid it can. The benefits to the people are inestimable and the small sum spent wise and prudent economy that will ultimately be returned an hundred fold.

Entertaining these views I shall cordially stand by my friend from South Carolina, and I trust his motion will prevail. I am on record in favor of expositions. I voted for the Omaha Exposition, for the Pan-American Exposition, for the St. Louis Exposition, and on the roll call I shall vote in favor of the Charleston Exposition. I like the people of the South; I believe in them, in their future, and I want to help them demonstrate to the world in an educational way their greatness, their grandeur, their commerce, their resources, their progress, and their material industries.

In my judgment, this exposition is most desirable and will do incalculable good. It will astonish many, and rivet the attention of America on the New South, with its innumerable opportunities, its untold wealth, and its myriad possibilities. Give the grand old South a chance, and the result will be as surprising as the vast amount of invaluable information disseminated will be beneficial.

This, sir, is not a local or a sectional matter. It will help and benefit our whole country. I dissent from the provincial and narrow view taken by some gentlemen on this question. The Columbian Exposition at Chicago did more for this country in different ways than the most eloquent tongue can ever portray.

Every exposition ever held in this country has been a great national blessing that has made for peace, for progress, and for civilization. We spend yearly millions and millions of dollars for useless objects and worthless matters, but when a few thousands of dollars are asked for educational purposes, for the benefit of humanity, for the diffusion of information, some all-wise and far-seeing cheeseparing statesman gravely arises and in sepulchral tones objects.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

New York Post-Office.

March 2, 1901.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, carrying enormous appropriations, is another demonstration of the cohesive power of public plunder. I doubt not it will pass without a division. I am somewhat surprised, to say the least, at the present attitude of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and I fail to hear his eloquent and emphatic protest against this bill, which will take hundreds and hundreds and thousands of dollars out of the public Treasury. Yesterday, the day before, and for several days last past, we have heard the gentleman from Illinois protesting against these kind of reckless and extravagant appropriations. But when this omnibus building bill comes up, appropriating this vast amount of money, we do not hear a word from the gentleman from Illinois. He is as dumb as an oyster. It is the old, old story. It only goes to show, however, how strong and powerful local patronage is to secure legislation.

The principal point I now desire to make is that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has refused to give New York City a new post-office. A bill for that purpose has been in the committee for six years. New York City is unjustly discriminated against. The post-office in New York City is old and dilapidated. It is no longer adapted to the postal affairs of the metropolis. It is a menace to the health and to the lives and limbs of every man employed in it. Thousands of men employed in the New York City post-office are compelled to work underground, standing part of the time during each twenty-four hours in water and in dampness. Every merchant, the chamber of commerce, the press, the people, every board of industry and board of trade in New York have petitioned Congress for the last three years to appropriate enough money to build a new and decent post-office in the city of New York.

I myself, sir, have filed with the Clerk of this House hundreds and hundreds of petitions and resolutions in favor of a new post-office in New York City. They have been referred to the committee and that has been the end of the matter. I want to enter my most emphatic protest against the outrageous way New York City is treated by Congress.

The post-office in New York City supplies more revenue to the Government than any other ten post-offices in the United States. The revenue from that post-office, over and above its expenses, amounts every year to between five and six millions of dollars. It is the greatest post-office for the distribution and the transmission of mail in this country; and I say in all sincerity that the great metropolis of the country should have a post-office that will be not alone a credit to the nation, but will preserve the lives and not menace the health of the people who are compelled to work in it.

The chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the committee appropriate money for every little crossroad post-office in the country. There is no trouble to get an appropriation of \$150,000 for some little country post-office that is an expense to the Government, but when it comes to the post-office of the city of New York the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is deaf to all supplications and to all the entreaties of the people of that great city.

The entire postal business of the country is centered in New

York City, and that city should have a post-office of adequate accommodations to facilitate business. We only ask for decent treatment—for what is just and right. I hold in my hand an editorial from the New York Herald of March 1 instant—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to me time enough to have this article read?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I have agreed to give out the time, and will have to take it from others.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print as a part of my remarks an editorial from the New York Herald of March 1, 1901, regarding the New York post-office.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print an editorial from the New York Herald in reference to the New York post-office.

Mr. MERCER. I object, Mr. Speaker, until I know what it is.

Mr. SULZER. It is a very short editorial from the New York Herald. It does not refer to the gentleman, but only to this post-office.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Deer in Alaska.

March 2, 1901.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the bill that "hereafter no hides of deer shall be exported from Alaska under a penalty of \$100 for each hide."

Mr. WARREN. I raise the point of order on the amendment; it is not germane, and is new legislation.

Mr. SULZER. Upon that I desire to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, when the Alaska code bill passed this House, by some inadvertence there was no provision put in that bill to protect the deer of Alaska. This was a mistake of grave importance. The deer of Alaska are being rapidly exterminated by the Indians, who hunt the deer simply for their hides. I am reliably informed—in fact, I know—that thousands and thousands of deer in Alaska are slaughtered every winter by the Indians. During the winter the deep snows compel the deer to come down from the mountains, and the natives ruthlessly slaughter them for their skins. Their skins are sold for from 50 cents to a dollar apiece. If this thing continues—

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule on the question.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, just one moment more. If this thing continues, in a very short time the deer of Alaska will be exterminated, and the people who live there and who to a certain extent subsist on the meat of the deer will be unable to get fresh meat. The natives slaughter the defenseless deer, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred leave the carcass to rot.

This amendment is a matter of great importance to the people of Alaska and in the interest of the protection of the deer. It ought to be adopted. Every true sportsman should favor it. I trust the gentleman will withdraw his point of order against the amendment. If he does not—and the Chair sustains it—I shall at

once prepare and introduce a bill to accomplish the purpose desired.

The SPEAKER. The bill has entire relation to educational matters in Alaska and no relation whatever to deer, and therefore the amendment is clearly out of order.

Philippine Commission.

March 3, 1901.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, but here politics are cared for by three Democrats.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to differ with my friend the gentleman from Tennessee. I believe this resolution should be defeated. It ought to be, in my opinion. For myself, I am opposed to Congressional junketing committees and Congressional junketing trips. If members of Congress want to visit Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippine Islands, let them go, and God speed them, but, sir, let them go at their own expense, and not at the expense of the taxpayers of the country. I sincerely believe the adoption of this resolution will be futile. It will establish a bad precedent, which ought not to be established. It will be a great expense, with no satisfactory results. It will give us no additional information. We have now all the information we want in regard to Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands to do our duty to humanity and to ourselves according to the traditions of this Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Charleston, S. C., Exposition.

March 3, 1901.

Mr. CANNON. I now yield to the gentleman from New York two minutes, and then I want to close the debate.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I can not concur in what the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has said. I dissent from his conclusions. There is nothing narrow, illiberal, or sectional about me. [Laughter and applause.] If we appropriate money for the St. Louis Exposition and for the Buffalo Pan-American Exposition, we ought to be big enough and brave enough and broad enough to appropriate \$250,000 for the Charleston Exposition. I am in favor of the exposition at Buffalo, I am in favor of the exposition at St. Louis, and, sir, I am in favor of the exposition at Charleston. They are all in the interest of the people, and will help to educate us and disseminate useful and valuable information.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York, I doubt not, is in favor of the Buffalo Exposition; he wants public money for a city in his own State, and yet he is opposed to appropriating money just as necessary in the interest of education and the dissemination of information for the Charleston Exposition. He should be consistent. His position is untenable. I hope the House will vote for all of these expositions or defeat them all. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

War Taxes.

December 15, 1900.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment to tax industrial combinations, and it seems to me it can not be successfully denied that there is much force and logic in all that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] has said in its favor. I agree with him that if we must raise more revenue it should be collected from wealth and not from toil. It is a matter of regret to me, and I believe it will be to the people generally, that the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee did not frame a bill to repeal the Spanish-American war-revenue taxes.

The war act of 1898, which imposed that taxation, was an emergency measure. It was passed hurriedly and without much consideration to raise immediate money for the purpose of successfully prosecuting the Spanish-American war. It was a war measure, and it was so described at that time by the leaders of the Republican party in this House, who gave assurances to the country that just so soon as the war was over these war taxes would be repealed.

The war has been over for more than two years and the Republican party is just now partially reducing the war taxes. I am opposed to a continuance of these war taxes in time of peace. They are obnoxious and vexatious, and should be repealed. In my judgment they could be repealed without causing a deficit. But if gentlemen on the other side believe otherwise and claim more revenue is necessary, not for an economical administration of public affairs, but for the purpose of carrying out Republican political schemes—some of which you now have under advisement—then, I say, that instead of raising the revenue from the poor, from the producers and the consumers of the country, you should raise this additional revenue by a tax on the trusts and the accumulated and idle wealth of the land. That would be fairer, more equitable, and more consistent.

I am opposed to robbing the many for the benefit of the few. I am opposed to unjust and unnecessary taxation. The war tax law is the worst kind of special legislation, and the bill now under consideration is a species of this special legislation carried to its logical sequence. It can not be justified now; it could only be tolerated in time of war; and I am of the opinion that the people of the country will be sadly disappointed by the action of the Republicans. They expected you to keep your promise and repeal these burdensome taxes.

Mr. Chairman, all legislation bestowing special benefits on the few is unjust and against the masses and for the classes. It has gone on until less than 8 per cent of the people own more than two-thirds of all the wealth of our country. It has been truly said that monarchies are destroyed by poverty and republics by wealth. If the greatest Republic the world has ever seen is destroyed, it will fall by this vicious system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few.

The total population of the United States is about 75,000,000. The total aggregate wealth of the United States, according to the best statistics that can be procured, is estimated at about \$75,000,000,000; and it appears, and no doubt much to the surprise of

many, that out of a total population of 75,000,000 less than 25,000 persons in the United States own more than one-half of the entire aggregate wealth of the land. And this has all been brought about during the last twenty-five years by combinations and conspiracies called "trusts" fostered by special legislation and nurtured by political favoritism.

The centralization of wealth in the hands of the few by the robbery of the many during the past quarter of a century has been simply enormous, and the facts and figures are appalling. Three-quarters of the entire wealth of our land appears to be concentrated in the hands of a very small minority of the people, and the number of persons constituting that minority grows smaller and smaller every year. I am in favor of repealing the war taxes and making the accumulated wealth of the land pay its just share of the burdens of government. This can readily and easily be done by a graduated corporation tax that will reach the dividends and watered stocks of the great industrial combinations and monopolies and by a graduated inheritance tax that will reach the idle and accumulated wealth of the land.

I am in favor of making the idle wealth, the monopolies, and all these great trusts, giant corporations, and selfish syndicates do what the Republican party by law compels the toilers, the producers, and the consumers to do, and that is to pay the taxes—pay their just share of the expenses of the Government.

By a graduated corporation tax and a graduated inheritance tax we would lift the tax burdens from the farmers, the workingmen, and the consumers and place them where they justly belong, besides establishing publicity and to some extent preventing the watering of stocks and the centralization of wealth.

In my judgment this system of a graduated inheritance tax and graduated corporation tax is the fairest, the most honest, and the most equitable system of taxation that can be devised; and I believe if it were put into operation that it would pay more than one-half the annual expenses of the Government. Believing as I do, I am glad to support this amendment and I sincerely hope it will be adopted.

To-day more than three-quarters of the idle wealth of this country escapes taxation and practically bears no part of the burdens of government. This is not right. I am glad to say that I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada will cure, to some extent at least, this inequality and injustice in our system of taxation. I trust that gentlemen on the other side of the House will vote in favor of the amendment. You can not say it is not fair and just.

If the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] answers that it will increase the revenue, then we reply that he and his associates on that side of the House can readily reduce the revenue by repealing some of the taxes on the necessities of life, and we will help them to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

“TAMMANY”

SPEECH
OF
CONGRESSMAN WM. SULZER
IN
TAMMANY HALL
Thursday Night, February 13th
1902

PRINTED BY ORDER OF
THE GENERAL COMMITTEE

PRESS OF
HICKOK PRINTING COMPANY
NEW YORK

“TAMMANY.”

SPEECH
OF
CONGRESSMAN WM. SULZER
IN
TAMMANY HALL,
THURSDAY NIGHT, FEBRUARY 13, 1902.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: Some time recently I was asked to be here to-night, and to speak to you about the history of Tammany.

Let me assure you that it is a matter of much personal gratification for me to be with you on this interesting occasion, and to thank you sincerely for your kind reception and cordial greeting. I know, however, in the brief time I shall occupy your attention, that it will be impossible for me to even partially meet your expectations, for the long story of the many commendable acts, and the eventful history of the glorious achievements, of Tammany, for a century and more, cannot be told in a night, and cannot be read in a day.

To know Tammany, and what it has done, you must study the annals of this city, the record of the state, and the history of the Republic.

THE PAST AND THE FUTURE.

Let me say at the commencement that it seems to me that this is a fitting time for grave retrospection of the past, for sober consideration of the present, for a hopeful glance of the future—a fitting time for us to ponder deeply, and like true brothers to take counsel. There is no acrimonious campaign raging now to sway our reason—no political strife to disturb our judgment. We meet as citizens of a common country—with a common interest—joint heirs of a common destiny. We meet to-night as patriots as in by-gone days—in the old wigwam—to inculcate the lessons of political truth—and to hand down from father to son unimpaired, the priceless story that all should know, and that cannot be too often told—the story of what this ancient society—grand old Tammany—in the years gone by has done for civil liberty and the rights of man. It is a story we can all be proud of, and point to with feelings of just admiration—it is in part the story of the rise and growth of the great American Republic—the greatest and the grandest government ever instituted among men.

TAMMANY AN INDIAN NAME.

The word "Tammany" is an Indian name and belongs to America. It was here before Columbus came, and it will be a part of our nomenclature while history lives. I like our Indian names. They belong to this continent. They are all our own, and for music and harmony and beauty cannot be surpassed in the world. We should do our best to preserve them for all time to come. It would be well if they were more in use.

MOUNT TAMMANY.

On the banks of the classic Delaware River—near the beautiful water-gap—is a stately mountain, rearing its majestic form amid the clouds—and looking down from its heroic heights can be viewed for miles the picturesque scenery of the surrounding country. It is an imperishable monument of nature. It has stood for ages and will stand—in all its grandeur—for ages yet to come. Many, many years ago—long ere the Revolution began—men called it 'Tammany' in honor of one of the most distinguished, one of the most accomplished, one of the wisest, and one of the most celebrated chieftains in all Indian history. This Indian, Tammany, was the trusted companion of William Penn, and the truest friend the early white settlers ever had. Penn speaks of him as a grand old man—vigorous in mind and body, wise, sagacious, and with high ideals of liberty. Many mythical tales and remarkable legends are told concerning this unique Indian, but there is no doubt of his wisdom, his bravery, his love of justice, and his sagacity. These stories about Tammany lived through all the years of the early period of our history, and by reason of them, Tammany became the patron saint of the Sons of Liberty during the entire Revolution. Many of his precepts were the watchwords of the Continentals during the times that tried men's souls; and his well known love of freedom the inspiration of the immortal minute men during the long, dark, terrible seven years' struggle for American Independence.

TAMMANY THE SAINT.

The camp-fires of the patriots burned brighter because St. Tammany had lived, and his example was the incentive to many an act of heroism in those stormy days unequalled in the world.

The wise sayings of Tammany made him a saint and the greatest of Indian philosophers. The wonderful story of his life is, to my mind, one of the most interesting character studies in all American biography. The truth and romance concerning him are inseparably interwoven in all the magical story of the formative period of the American nation.

It is said of Tammany that he loved liberty better than life.

THE TAMMANY SOCIETY.

And so, my friends, this Society—like the mountain on the Delaware—took its name, a name known far and near to-day, from this illustrious Indian chieftain. It is founded on the rock of freedom, its precepts are his precepts, its character his character and it is now, ever has been, and ever will be, safe against the storms of time, because it is dedicated to the immortal principle that civil liberty is the glory of man.

Amid the throes of the greatest revolution for freedom that ever rocked the world, the germ of the Society of Tammany was generated and came into being. Men who stake their lives for liberty know how

to value liberty and how to preserve it. We can only be free by making others free. The patriots who risked all for American Independence appreciated what had been won and were determined not to lose it. After the stress of seven years of war and privation, after the shock and suffering of battle, after peace had been declared and America had taken her place among the nations of the world, incident to it all, and on the ruins of long years of tyranny and despotism two societies were formed, one on the banks of the Hudson, called the "Society of Cincinnati," and the other here, in the City of New York, called the "Tammany Society of the Columbian Order." The first was organized by the officers of the Revolution to be an exclusive organization based on the feudal principle of primogeniture, only officers and their eldest son in a direct line were to be eligible for membership. The second—the Tammany Society—was organized by the rank and file of the soldiers who fought for American liberty. It was inclusive and based on the immortal principles of the Declaration of Independence.

The Society of Cincinnati was aristocracy personified—the Tammany Society was Democracy deified. One was for the few, the other for the many—one hereditary—the other equality.

Both of these societies have lived through all the years, but you hear very little of the one and a great deal of the other.

TAMMANY SPRANG FROM THE REVOLUTION.

Tammany drew its first inspiration from the Revolution. It stands to-day, and has ever stood, for all that great struggle accomplished. Its mission is human liberty, its cause the rights of man.

The Tammany Society is generally misunderstood, and sometimes wilfully misrepresented by those who are not members of it, and unfamiliar with its organization and its workings. There is the Tammany Society, or Columbian Order, which is a fraternal organization, dedicated to the noblest works of mankind; and there is the Tammany political organization, dedicated to Democratic principles, and to the welfare of the people and the public weal.

INCORPORATED IN 1805.

Two weeks after George Washington took the oath of office as the first President of the United States, on the steps of the old City Hall in Wall street, the Tammany Society, or Columbian Order, was formally organized by William Mooney and other distinguished citizens of our municipality. In 1805 it was incorporated by an act of the Legislature. Its object was to afford relief to indigent and distressed members of the association, their widows and orphans, and others who might be found worthy and proper objects of its charity. It is a benevolent institution with a monument of eternal fame in ten thousand kind and noble acts and glorious deeds. Since its organization, it has, without an exception, annually celebrated Independence Day. It is based on the rock of liberty, its corner-stone is freedom, its walls the bulwarks of our free institutions, its inner sanctity a temple of justice, and its future, as its past, dedicated to the great truths Thomas Jefferson penned in the Declaration of Independence.

ITS GREAT ROLL OF MEMBERSHIP.

Call the roll of its illustrious membership for the past one hundred years, and you will listen to the names of presidents and poets, soldiers

and statesmen, governors and mayors, great judges, great merchants, great legislators, great writers, and distinguished citizens in every walk of life and in every avenue of industry, the Nation's greatest and most patriotic sons, whose deeds of nobility, whose acts of valor, and whose works in the vineyard of mankind make our history the proudest boast of an American citizen.

In the words of Horatio Seymour, standing in this hall, on a memorable occasion: "This society, during its long history, has embraced among its members many of the most eminent men of the state and nation. It has always proved true, not only to national honor, but to the rights of the state and the best interests of its citizens."

WHY THE SOCIETY ADOPTED ABORIGINAL FORMS.

Another object of the Society was to conciliate the numerous tribes of Indians who were devastating the defenseless frontiers and carrying death and desolation, with fire and tomahawk, to the homes of the intrepid pioneers. Out of reverence to the memory of the venerated chief Tammany, and the better to cultivate friendly relations with the Indian tribes, the Society adopted aboriginal forms, costumes and ceremonies. The year was divided into four seasons. December, January and February was the Season of the Snows; March, April and May, the Season of Blossoms; June, July and August, the Season of Fruits, September, October and November, the Season of Hunting; and these seasons were divided into Moons.

The members of the Society were divided into thirteen tribes, corresponding to the number of the original States.

New York was the Eagle tribe; Delaware, the Tiger; Virginia, the Deer; Georgia, the Wolf; North Carolina, the Buffalo; Pennsylvania, the Bee; Connecticut, the Beaver; New Hampshire, the Squirrel; Maryland, the Fox; New Jersey, the Tortoise; Massachusetts, the Bear; Rhode Island, the Eel, and South Carolina, the Dog. Formerly, when members joined the Society, either they chose the tribe to which they proposed to belong, or were assigned to one by the Grand Sachem; but this observance has now fallen into disuse. They are all now called 'Tigers,' probably from the characteristics which the great Chief Tammany, in his farewell legendary address to the children of his several tribes, attributed to the Tiger.

The Society elects annually thirteen Sachems, the number of the original thirteen states. One of them is elected as the Grand Sachem. This body forms the Council presided over by the Grand Sachem, which meets quarterly for the transaction of business.

The other officers of the Society are a Scribe, a treasurer, a sagamore and a wiskinskie. The duty of the scribe is to record the proceedings of the Society; of the sagamore to take charge of its property, and of the wiskinskie to act as doorkeeper.

INITIATION.

Members of the Society, other than honorary, are proposed at one meeting, elected at the next, and initiated at the next. They must have nearly a unanimous vote to be elected. The names of the honorary members are inscribed on a roll separate from the names of the active members. At the initiation of the Grand Sachem the 'Et-hoh Song' is sung, commencing:

"Brothers, our Council-fire shines bright, Et-hoh."

At the initiation of a member, a different one is sung, the first stanza of which is as follows:

"Sacred's the ground where Freedom's found
And Virtue stamps her name;
Our hearts entwine at friendship's shrine,
And Union fans the flame.
Our hearts sincere,
Shall greet you here.
With joyful voice
Confirm your choice.
Et-hoh! Et-hoh! Et-hoh!"

Every member who proposes a person for initiation is required to vouch that he is a true patriot and firmly attached to the Constitution of the United States.

MEETING PLACES OF THE SOCIETY.

The Society first met in Fraunce's old tavern near the Battery. From there it went, in 1798, to the wigwam at Martling's, the corner of Spruce and Nassau streets, where it remained until 1812, when it removed to the wigwam on the site of the present "Sun" building, at the corner of Frankfort and Nassau streets. Here it remained until 1868, when it removed to its present magnificent wigwam on East Fourteenth street. In 1868 this wigwam was opened with great pomp and much ceremony. In the same year the Democratic National Convention was held in the wigwam and that great Democrat, Horatio Seymour, nominated for President. From then until now this has been the real home of Democracy in the City of New York.

What a history of Democratic gatherings these walls could tell! What eloquence has here been heard for equal rights and human liberty!

THE POLITICAL TAMMANY.

Besides the Tammany Society there is also in connection with it the Tammany political organization the greatest Democratic organization in the country. It first asserted itself in the closing days of the 18th century. It was organized under the leadership of the founders of the Democratic party—Jefferson and Burr. It first attacked the powerful Federal party which was rapidly establishing, on the ruins of monarchy, an aristocracy.

Before 1800 Tammany was composed of men of different political opinions, and took no prominent part in politics. But in the campaign of that year, which resulted in a decided victory for the people, its members stood together, the Federal party received its death blow; the power of the aristocracy was broken, the tendencies to empire were swept away, and Thomas Jefferson elected President of the United States. It was the first and most signal of Democratic triumphs in this country. It was the end of the Federal party.

AN EPOCH.

The influence of that victory was far-reaching and is felt to-day. It was an epoch. Its impulse on our political destiny is familiar to all students of history. Books have been written about it and the subject is inexhaustible. It was a crisis in our political history. The people won, and the influence of Tammany in that memorable contest turned the current of events, settled for all time the complexion of our institutions, and demonstrated that this is a government of the people, guaranteeing equality before the law, and deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

From thence forward the influence of Tammany has been felt in every campaign. It has been for the people and for Democracy. It has done more for the state, and more for this great city, than any other political organization that ever existed.

ITS INFLUENCE.—WHAT IT HAS DONE.

The influence of Tammany on the early destiny of our country cannot be overestimated or exaggerated. It supported and lent lustre to the administration of Washington. It harmonized every conflicting faction in the early days of the Republic. It insisted on the adoption and ratification of the Federal Constitution, and gave to the people the power which they have ever since enjoyed under the organic law of the land. It protested against titles and aristocracy. It did not believe in lords and dukes and kings and queens. It thwarted the schemes of the enemies of the Republic. It believed the Revolutionary war had not been fought in vain but had brought about a new era in the governments of the world. From that day to this, it has never been false to its early traditions, to its history, or the tenets and objects of its founders. It has always been true to the principles of Jefferson and the Constitution. It has always responded to every call of the distressed and oppressed in every land and every clime. By personal subscription it raised sufficient funds to gather the remains of the martyred patriots, who died in British prison-ships in the cause of Independence, and whose bones lay bleaching in the sun, whitening the shores of the East River and buried them with honor beneath the beautiful mausoleum where they now rest. It supported Jefferson in his great reform administration, it stood with him for a bill of rights and helped to write them in the Constitution; it denounced the Alien and Sedition laws and demanded their repeal; it supported Jefferson in the Louisiana purchase and helped to ratify that treaty; it stood for manhood, suffrage and ultimately wrote the law on our statute books; it believed in the flag and wanted the flag to protect American citizens on land and sea, at home or abroad; it urged Madison to protect American sailors from British depredations and ultimately to enforce it by declaring war against England. It never faltered in the war of 1812; it loyally aided and supported the government, denounced the proceedings of the treasonable Hartford Convention and the traitors who burned blue lights on the shores of New England. It first suggested and proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine. It organized, equipped and sent to the front a regiment in every war, and has done a thousand other glorious and patriotic deeds for the historian to record on every page of American history.

ANDREW JACKSON.

Andrew Jackson—the hero of New Orleans—loved Tammany, sat by its council fires and drew from its teachings the inspiration to defy the monopoly of the United States Bank, to destroy nullification and to preserve the Union and the Constitution.

In October, 1792, and again in October, 1892, the Tammany Society celebrated the 300th and 400th anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus—the only celebrations of the event in this country.

Time will not admit of more than a brief mention of many of the other achievements of Tammany as a patriotic or political organization, in fostering the love of liberty and the spirit of National Independence, and in maintaining the cause of the masses.

The Tammany Society was the first to celebrate Washington's birthday after his inauguration as President in 1789.

It has never omitted the celebration of the birthday of our National Independence—the Fourth of July—and, as is believed, is the only Society in the United States which has always performed that patriotic duty.

TAMMANY FOR MAN.

The first Constitution of the State, adopted in 1777, limited the right to vote by a property qualification, whereby the great masses of the people stood disfranchised. The influence of Tammany was exerted in the most successful way in framing the Constitutions of 1821 and 1846, extending the ballot and establishing the system of manhood suffrage, as we have it in this state to-day.

At different times and by various names, such as "American party," "Know-Nothing party," and others, which need not now be mentioned in particular, it has been attempted to proscribe persons not born in the United States and to prevent their becoming citizens, or to delay their admission as such by a very extended term; but Tammany has always vigorously opposed all attempts at proscription, and has maintained our wise and liberal National policy, which has always welcomed to our shores and invited to our citizenship the down-trodden people of other nations.

Tammany has always been opposed to monopolies, to class legislation, to all laws to favor an individual or class of individuals over the other members of the community in the acquisition of wealth or in the enjoyment of special privileges.

TAMMANY LOYAL TO THE UNION.

It is a matter of history that Tammany has always stood firmly for the preservation of the Union, and against every influence which would sever its bonds, or mar the fraternal and kindly relations that should exist between the great family of states.

During the Civil War the Tammany Society fitted out and sent a fully equipped regiment to the field of battle, known as the "Tammany Regiment," and the members of the organization raised other regiments and brigades for the war.

Tammany has always stood for the cause of labor and has championed every reasonable measure which the labor organizations themselves devised for the improvement of the condition of the masses.

Its sympathy and its efforts have gone out to every people—in every land—in the occident and in the orient—struggling for liberty and the rights of self-government.

Such, my friends, in brief, is an outline in part of the history of this grand old Tammany organization. What a record it presents!

And yet many well meaning citizens continually revile Tammany and denounce the organization as a danger and menace to free institutions. Instead of being a menace and threatening the stability of our institutions, why is it not a safeguard? I ask, has any great victory in the history of the world, for the good and the right, ever been won without organization? Men may take a pessimistic view of organization to-day because it seems to be popular, but in the day of darkness and trouble and defeat, nothing can accomplish more good for the greatest number than the determined efforts of men united together under one grand leadership, fighting for principles that represent truth, justice and humanity.

IN ORGANIZATION THERE IS STRENGTH.

Organization is the secret of success in all great undertakings; very little can be accomplished by individual effort. In organization there is strength. The history of the world teaches this and successfully demonstrates the falsity of every argument advanced against it. Every step in the world's progress, every movement for the betterment of humanity has been accomplished by organization. In my judgment more can be done for the principles of the Democratic party, and for the benefit of society at large, by systematic organization with fixed purposes and a determination to succeed than in any other way. We must deal with men as we find them and not as we would wish them—with things as they are, and not as we desire. We cannot have everything as we would like until the millenium is at hand. This is a practical age—let us be practical.

I am a Democrat. I believe in the great fundamental principles of Democracy. I believe we should all stand together—organize and organize—to achieve victory in the cause of the people.

OPPOSITION UNJUST.

Many intelligent and worthy people in our city, I know, and I believe, are opposed to Tammany because they know so little about it. They hear it called an organization, and hence straightway denounce it and all organizations. It would be as logical and equally as absurd to denounce all government because you do not like the political machinery of the Chinese Empire. From the unit of the family to the highest perfection of civilization everything is organization in a greater or a lesser degree. All government, all society, all business, all association and all institutions are based on the sure foundation of more or less perfect organization. It is the organization of the drilled regiment that makes it effective and capable of successfully coping with the multitude and the mob. It is the discipline of the police organization that gives the citizen confidence in the security of his person and his property. It is the trained organization of the fireman that makes insurance rates so low in our city. Opposition to organization is unjust, undemocratic and un-American. What great movement has ever succeeded without organization? From the beginning of civilization, from the establishment of the Christian church, from the discovery of America, from the Revolution to the present day, everything that has been accomplished for the progress of the world and the advancement of the human race has been done by organized effort and concerted action. Every man here knows that to be true. What organization has done in the past it can do in the future. Let us organize—organize!

If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, Democratic organization is its safeguard and best guarantee.

TAMMANY IN WAR.

Tammany supported Polk and Marcy in the war with Mexico, in the annexation of Texas and the acquisition of California, which established our boundaries on the Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico.

When the Civil War of 1861 followed the election of Lincoln, the influence of Tammany was instantly shown in the patriotic action of the Common Council of our City, where its power was supreme, pledging to the President all the resources of the municipality, in men and money, for the support of the Government, in the enforcement of the laws and to maintain the Union.

Let me here recall to your memory the concluding resolutions of the series, unanimously adopted by the New York Common Council, at a special meeting of the Board of Aldermen, convened on the 19th of April, 1861, while the echoes of Sumter were still heard.

RESOLVED, That we invoke at this crisis the unselfish patriotism and the unfaltering loyalty which have been uniformly manifested in all periods of national peril by the population of the City of New York; and while we reiterate our undiminished affection for the friends of the Union who have gallantly and faithfully labored in the Southern States for the preservation of peace and the restoration of fraternal relations among the people, and our readiness to co-operate with them in all honorable measures of reconciliation, yet we only give expression to the convictions of our constituents when we declare it to be their unalterable purpose, as it is their solemn duty, to do all in their power to uphold and defend the integrity of the Union and to vindicate the honor of our flag and to crush the power of those who are enemies in war, as in peace they were friends.

PRESIDENT LINCOLN.

President Lincoln said to General Sickles, referring to this action of our city government, a few days afterward, "Sickles, I have here on my table the resolutions passed by your Common Council appropriating a million of dollars toward raising men for this war and promising to do all in the power of your authorities to support the government. When these resolutions were brought to me I felt my burden lighter. I felt that when men break through party lines and take this patriotic stand for the government and the Union, all must come out well in the end."

This action of the Common Council of New York made the great city a unit for national defense; it united all parties for the Union.

But in that momentous crisis Tammany did more.

THE TAMMANY REGIMENT.

The Forty-second New York Infantry was raised and organized by the Tammany Society in the City of New York, in May and June, 1861. The regiment was taken to the field by the Grand Sachem of that year, Colonel William D. Kennedy, who died a few days afterward in Washington. Colonel Kennedy was succeeded by Captain Milton Cogswell, an accomplished officer of the regular army.

Early in the same year, 1861, several other Tammany leaders raised regiments and brigades for the war. Among them the regiment organized by General John Cochrane, and the brigades of General Thomas Francis Meagher and General Daniel E. Sickles.

Colonel Nugent's Sixty-ninth Regiment lost more men in battle, killed and wounded, than any infantry regiment from the State of New York. At Antietam, eight color-bearers of the Irish Brigade were shot down at Bloody Lane, but the brigade carried the position. At Fredericksburg the color-sergeant of the 69th was found dead with his flag concealed and wrapped around his body, a bullet having pierced the flag and his heart.

At Gettysburg the Tammany Regiment was in the thick of the fight and lost in killed and wounded 18 officers and 223 enlisted men; and considering the total number of men present in line of battle this record gives the Forty-second the right to be included, as history has already included it, among the great fighting regiments of the war.

On the battlefield of Gettysburg Tammany has erected a magnificent monument to the brave and gallant Tammany regiment.

In the recent Spanish-American war Tammany also organized and equipped a regiment and offered it to the government, but it was never mustered into service.

UNWARRANTED DENUNCIATION.

The men who, in season and out of season, continually denounce Tammany and Democracy—who denounce its leaders, who revile it and prophecy all evil concerning it, know not of what they talk. Its organization is thoroughly simply and absolutely Democratic. In this city there are the various Assembly Districts—each divided into election districts, containing about four hundred voters. In each Assembly District the primary meeting is held strictly according to law—ample notice is given of the time and place by publication and all Democrats are cordially invited to attend and participate in its proceedings and deliberations. This is the whole system in a nut-shell. What could be less dictatorial, less autocratic and more in harmony with our Democratic institutions? All power comes from the people. These men and these committees represent constituencies. If they neglect their duty, if they prove false to their trust—the remedy is in the hands of the people and can always promptly and effectually be applied.

Every Democrat in the city is welcome and if the organization is not all that he could wish, the fault, if fault there be, is, to some extent, to say the least, his fault. Chronic fault-finding is unfair, sweeping denunciation unwarranted.

TAMMANY IS DEMOCRACY.

Tammany is Democracy. Tammany needs no defense from any man. It needs no eulogy but its own history, its own record, and its own indefatigable efforts for its principles and the people. That record and that history speak in trumpet tones to the world more eloquently than words of mine. Read its history, read what it has done for the people in many a struggle, and for the Democratic party, ere you judge it and condemn. In the words of William L. Marcy, "Do not impugn our motives and convict us on the bickerings of pigmy malice and the ravings of malefactors whose only object is the destruction of every barrier which can possibly defend the liberties of our country."

Do not let me be misunderstood. We all know, and it cannot be denied, that there are pages in its history that its true and sincere friends would prefer to have rewritten. It cannot be denied that there have been times in its history when the men at the helm steered the old ship near dangerous shoals, but it has never been wrecked. It has survived all defeats; frustrated and baffled all the schemes of its enemies; lived down the calumnies of generations, and to-day it is greater and grander, broader and more liberal, more influential and capable of accomplishing more for the good of the people and the common weal than ever before.

It has seen the Federal party come and go; it destroyed the Tory party; made the American party ridiculous; the Know-Nothing party odious; it saw the great Whig party rise and fall and pass away, and the time will come when its present political enemy, the Republican party, will only be a memory—but Tammany will go on and on—forever—to its truer and grander destiny.

To quote from a poem read by John G. Saxe in Tammany in 1870,

"Then success to old Tammany, long may it stand
The bulwark of freedom—the pride of the land."

DEMOCRATS SHOULD STAND TOGETHER.

All the Democrats of this metropolis should stand together. All should be harmony. In essentials—unity—in non-essentials—toleration. But at all times organization. Every Democrat should strive with a singleness of purpose to redeem our party and our city. Let us stand firm by our principles, our pledges and our convictions, and success will surely crown our efforts, and our grandest and greatest victories will be achieved in the future. Republicanism is on the wane—its night is near at hand. Democracy has its face to the morning sun. Victory will soon be ours.

Far be it from me to brand an honest difference of opinion with the stamp of faction, which is always the parent of discontent and revolution. But when independence to regular organization and true Democratic principles springs from jealousy, vanity and petty ambition, and protest against regularity is a mere desire for a change in the existing order of affairs, coupled with the hope of personal advantage, it should be beneath the contempt of honest Democrats and sincere and patriotic citizens. Tammany is liberal and magnanimous, tolerant and cosmopolitan. It rises superior to caste, and has no race prejudice. It recognizes honest effort, appreciates ability, and rewards industry.

LEADER NIXON.

My friends, in our leader, Mr. Nixon, we have an honest, a fearless, an intrepid chieftain. He is a true Democrat, liberal, broad-minded, far-seeing and generous. He is the leader of Tammany in fact as well as in name. Let there be no doubt about this. Let us all rally to his support; let us all loyally stand by him and victory will follow as day follows night.

TAMMANY'S WELCOME.

Come into Tammany! It welcomes you. We appeal to all—to the young and the old—to all Democrats. Its doors are always open. Participate in its deliberations and rejoice in its victories. Every Democrat in the city should belong to its organization, and every Democrat in the country should be its friend. You can help to shape its course. You can help to guide its action. You can help to make it all that we wish and all that it should be—a great vehicle for truth—a great temple for justice, and a great agency for Democracy. Let us all stand together for honesty and righteousness—for Democracy and humanity—

“For the cause that lacks assistance;
For the wrongs that need resistance;
For the future in the distance;
And the good that we can do.”

JUSTICE TO THE LETTER CARRIERS.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 19, 1902.

WASHINGTON.

1902.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 11853) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes—

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York. I now yield ten minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: For some time past there has been a great deal of talk by the Republicans in this House in favor of and in the defense of the trusts. To-day several Republicans have taken advantage of the pending measure before the House to make set speeches which seek to justify the position of the Republican party in favor of monopolies.

It is well known that every Democrat on this side of the House is opposed to trusts and monopolies, and if we Democrats had our way we would put all goods manufactured by a monopoly on the free list, especially where the reports and statistics and facts demonstrated that the monopoly was selling its manufactured goods cheaper in other countries than here. In such a case our people should not be taxed to support the monopoly. The protection of the protective tariff should be repealed. But we are in a hopeless minority. We can not initiate and pass bills to control trusts and to destroy monopolies. The people know the Republicans are responsible.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise, however, for the purpose of discussing the trust question. I am now, always have been, and always will be opposed to monopolies, and to the criminal trusts. At this time I simply want to point out what is apparrent to all—that the Republicans are so busy in this Congress defending and justifying and helping the great trusts and monopolies of the country that they have not time to consider the crying wants of the people, the urgent demands of the rank and file, and the ne-

cessity of much important and meritorious legislation pending in the House and in its committees.

Now, sir; I want to state that in every Congress since I have been here a bill has been introduced in the interest of and for the benefit of the letter carriers. In three different Congresses—namely, the Fifty-fourth, the Fifty-fifth, and the Fifty-sixth—I had the honor of introducing such a bill myself, and I worked as hard as I could, before the committee, with members of the House—in season and out of season—continually to get a favorable report, but all in vain. I never could get the Republicans on the committee to report the bill and do justice to the deserving letter carriers of the country. Time and time again on the floor of this House have I and others pleaded for decent treatment and fair play for the letter carriers.

If there ever was a bill introduced in this House that ought to appeal to every member as a matter of right and justice, it is the letter carriers' bill. The bill was introduced in this Congress early in the session—to be accurate, on the 13th day of December, 1901—by the gentleman from Michigan. The Speaker referred it to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

It is there now. It is sleeping in that committee, and it will never wake up, never come out, if we do not demand and insist that the committee report it favorably. The bill is so short that I will ask the indulgence of the House while I read it. Besides, I want it to go in the RECORD as part of my remarks, so that all who are concerned in the matter can read it and judge of its merit. It is entitled "A bill to increase the pay of letter carriers," and reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after June 30, 1902, the pay of letter carriers in cities of more than 75,000 population for the first year of service shall be \$600; for the second year of service shall be \$500; for the third year of service shall be \$1,000; for the fourth year of service and thereafter shall be \$1,200. And after June 30, 1902, the pay of letter carriers in cities of a population of under 75,000 for the first year of service shall be \$600; for the second year of service, \$800; for the third year of service and thereafter, \$1,000.

SEC. 2. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

That is all there is to it—a most commendable bill. Why should it not be reported? Why should it be smothered in the committee? Why should it not be presented to the House and the members given an opportunity to vote for it or against it? We want a record on this bill. We want to fix responsibility.

We want to find out who are the friends and who are the enemies of the letter carriers. I am a friend of the letter carriers. I am proud to say that. The Government in all its service has no more honest, no more tireless, no more faithful employees. Their claims are just and should be recognized.

These men are the most efficient, the hardest worked in all the country's service, and the poorest paid. The letter carriers of the land are compelled to toil day in and day out—in sunshine and in storm, in winter and in summer, in all kinds of weather—sometimes eighteen hours out of the twenty-four, and taking all other employees in the various departments of the Federal Government as a basis for comparison, it can not be denied that the letter carriers render the most and the hardest work for the smallest remuneration. Let us be just to these honest, hard-working, faithful men.

Now, sir, why is it when every Democrat, I believe, on this side of the House is anxious for a favorable report of this bill, is anxious to have it passed, is anxious to vote for it to make it a law, why is it, I ask, that the Republicans in this House smother the bill every session in the committee? Why is the Republican party against the letter-carriers' bill? Is it because a few Republican leaders of this House are opposed to giving the letter carriers decent wages? Or is it because the Republicans are so busy legislating for monopoly that they have no time to legislate for man? Let the Republican party answer, and let man answer the Republican party.

There is a great blizzard, or has been a great blizzard, in New York City. The first city in the land is locked in the embrace of one of the worst storms for years. The streets are blocked with snow and ice. It is almost impossible for the ordinary pedestrian to get around, but the mail must be delivered, and the letter carriers are compelled to go through these streets—almost impassable—with pounds and pounds of mail matter on their backs. They have to go through streets now that horses can not get through, that vehicles can not go through, and are compelled to go through these streets four and five times a day and deliver the mail.

Rest for man, rest for beast, but no rest for the indefatigable letter carrier. He must go, he must do his work, deliver the mail

on his route, no matter what the weather, no matter what the consequences to his health or his life. And yet, take them all in all, they are courteous, long suffering, uncomplaining, honest, assiduous, and industrious. How few of our citizens ever think of their trials, their wants, their health, and their little ones at home. Again and again I have watched them and sympathized with them—with their hopes and their sorrows.

To-day my heart goes out to them. I can not refrain from making this appeal in their behalf for simple justice. How I wish it were in my power to aid them, to pass and enact into law this bill they all want, they all pray for; this bill that is so fair and so just, that appeals to every right-thinking citizen in all the land, and that challenges adverse criticism. How much time and money we waste here for useless and worthless things! It is terrible when one soberly considers it all—and then, again, so much for the few, so little for the many. How easy for the monopolies and the powerful to pass a bill—a bad bill—and how difficult for the poor and the weak, the many, to pass a bill—a good bill. It is a just commentary. It should make us pause at times and think.

How poorly, how miserably the letter carriers are paid! Under the present law they do not, and can not, earn enough, no matter how long they have been in the service of the Government or how many hours a day they labor, to keep body and soul together. And what do they get? A mere pittance a month that is not enough to economically support one man. It is a disgrace, a crying shame. Many of these letter carriers have wives and children—little homes—and these wives and children in many cases are to-day in want.

The head of the household does not get paid enough by the Government to live half way decently. But it is not the Government's fault, it is the fault of the Republican leaders here in Congress. I want to appeal to the Republicans of this House, in the name of justice and fair play, in the name of decency, that when they are doing so much for organized capital, so much for criminal syndicates, so much for monopolies, for God's sake to do something for the poor letter carriers. [Applause.]

Let us be honest. Let us be just. Let us be true to the dic-

tates of our nobler impulses, and if we are this bill—so honest and so just and so earnestly desired—will soon be reported, speedily passed, and a law on our statute books. Is there a man here opposed to it? If so, let him come out in the open and have the courage to get up and say so. I pause for an answer. No one opposed to it, and yet the bill lies in the committee, and it seems almost impossible to ever get it out. But something is going to happen. It will come out. It will be reported, never fear.

Sir, I speak plain. The case demands plain speaking. I serve notice now on the Republican leaders of this House that I shall make it my business to go deeper in this subject—to find out why this meritorious measure is delayed and the ends of justice to the letter carriers defeated. If no one else will do so, I will ascertain and lodge the responsibility where it belongs. Everyone here knows, if he knows anything, that this is a just and worthy bill and if it came before this House for a vote it would pass by an overwhelming majority.

Why should a few men on the Republican side have it in their power to deprive us all of an opportunity to vote for the bill? It is an outrage, but it is true, and knowing the facts as I do, I would despair of ever passing this bill, of ever getting it reported, if it were not for the fact that recently the New York Journal, that fearless foe of injustice and monopoly, that champion of the right and the plain people, that great American newspaper, has taken up the cause of the letter carriers and intends to see to it that they get fair play and equitable treatment.

The Journal is a mighty power for good. I believe the letter carriers will now win, because the Journal has never lost a battle when enlisted in a just cause, and the letter-carrier's cause is just. Then success to the New York Journal and speedy success to the letter-carrier's bill, and if its friends in this House will all stand together I feel confident, and I predict victory will ere long crown our efforts and the bill will soon become a law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

I am glad the bright day is not far distant when the Cuban Republic will take her place among the nations of the earth. May success, happiness, prosperity, and domestic tranquillity abide with her hereafter forever, is my fervent prayer.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

MARCH 27, 1902.



WASHINGTON.

1902.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12804) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday afternoon I sent to the Clerk's desk an article from the Philadelphia North American dated March 14, 1902, which I desired to have read. At that time it was objected to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DICK]. I now send to the Clerk the same paper to have the article read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From Philadelphia North American, March 14, 1902.]

REPRESENTATIVE SULZER INTRODUCES A BILL INTENDED TO REFORM PRESENT TARIFF LAW—AINS BLOW AT SUGAR TRUST—WOULD REMOVE COLOR RESTRICTION AND OPEN MARKET TO CUBAN PRODUCERS.

[By Angus McSweeney.]

WASHINGTON, March 13, 1902.

The North American's exposure of sugar-trust methods is having its effect.

Representative SULZER, of New York, to-day introduced in the House a bill to amend the present tariff law by striking from the sugar schedule the provision that all sugars above No. 16, Dutch standard in color, shall pay a duty of 1 ³/₄ cents a pound.

This action was based directly upon the statements in the North American of Tuesday showing the enormous protection given the sugar trust by the color restriction in the tariff law and the palpable deception practiced by Congress, both by its insertion in the law and by its retention there.

As its author is a member of the Democratic minority, Mr. SULZER's bill will be scoffed at by the members of the Ways and Means Committee, but it will serve as a beginning of the investigation which should be demanded by the country, and which should lead to favorable action upon the bill as soon as the purposes aimed at are generally understood.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, and it is before that committee now. Mr. SULZER expects to obtain his first hearing and a hearing also for the witnesses he will produce to testify in behalf of his proposition.

Except by reports of the trust interests, it is not easy to see how objections to the bill can be successfully argued. It proposes no reduction in the rates of duty established by existing law upon sugar according to its grade of purity, and leaves the duty of 1 ³/₄ cents a pound upon refined sugar, but eliminates the color restriction and opens the way to the sugar producers of Cuba to send their highest grades of sugar to the United States for sale in the markets in competition with sugar-trust products.

Of course the measure will be opposed by the trust and by all trust advocates in Congress, but there is no sentiment outside the two legislative Chambers in favor of trust privileges, and sooner or later SULZER's proposition will be accepted. The North American has aroused the spirit of inquiry, and nothing more is needed to expose the trick by which the trust has secured absolute control of the sugar market. Mr. SULZER said to-day respecting his measure:

"Everyone must admit that the whole usefulness of the Dutch standard lies in the fact that, first, it forces the planters to sell exclusively to the trust, and, second, of course, it forces the people to buy exclusively of the trust. It is merely a means of assuring to the trust an absolute monopoly in the sugar business. The Cubans, who would be glad to market their sugars direct and pay the higher duties, which will be required according to a really scientific test, are unable to do so, and the people of the United States, who would be glad to buy their sugar direct from the producers, are unable to do so.

"Ingenuity of man could not have devised a more perfect and admirable method of securing for a limited number of capitalists an absolute monopoly of an important article of food than this one which lies hidden in that apparently innocent color restriction. It helps nobody but the trust, it keeps the planters poor, and it robs the people. All this can be easily proved, and that is what I purpose to do. It was because I was certain of it that I introduced the bill."

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the article just read is from one of the most fearless, one of the most honest, and one of the greatest Republican newspapers in this country, the Philadelphia North American. The article speaks for itself. I have had it read from the Clerk's desk so that it will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that every member of this House will take the trouble to read it.

The article clearly, fully, and intelligently tells the purpose of the bill I introduced in this House on the 13th day of this month. The bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee by the Speaker, and I request, and indulge the hope, that it will ere long be favorably reported.

Let me reiterate what I have frequently said before on this floor, that I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of Cuba and of the Cubans. The record will show that ever since I have been a member of this House I have done all in my power for the Cuban people. I am glad the bright day is not far distant when the Cuban Republic will take her place among the nations of the earth. May success, happiness, prosperity, and domestic tranquillity abide with her hereafter forever, is my fervent prayer. [Applause.]

The time is at hand, nevertheless, when we must live up to our sacred obligations to Cuba. We must grant her the freedom and the independence promised. We must launch this young Republic of Cuba on the ocean of nations and say to all the world, Cuba is free and independent. We must say to every nation, She is our creation—a daughter of the great Republic—and any interference with her will be an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. We must now grant her immediate trade relief. In a commercial way she is at our mercy. That is not her fault—it is our fault. Congress has made it practically impossible for Cuba to market her products in other countries; they must be sold here, and they can not be sold in this country at present except at a ruinous loss, unless our tariff law is repealed or modified. This must be done at once—it should have been done months ago. If it is not speedily done I predict that conditions in Cuba will soon be worse than they ever were before. The situation is serious and admits of no further delay. The people want Congress to act.

The Republican party is responsible for the deplorable commercial condition now existing in Cuba. The Republican party, wedded to its high protective-tariff policy, would apparently rather witness the starvation of the Cubans than consent to reduce to a slight degree for Cuba its present system of outrageous

tariff taxes. What a spectacle of commercial selfishness, monopolistic greed, and political shortsightedness the Republican party presents to day! We have been in session here since the first Monday of last December, and nothing has been done to afford relief to the Cubans.

The President, the Secretary of War, General Wood, President-elect Palma, and every person familiar with the present situation in Cuba have urged Congress to reduce the existing tariff taxes on Cuban exports to this country at least 50 per cent. But nothing has been done. The Republican leaders can not agree, the Ways and Means Committee will not act, and the industrial arm of Cuba is becoming paralyzed. I predict that if this selfish policy is continued much longer the doctrine of Republican protection will soon be destroyed by its foolish worshippers.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of doing something now to avert calamity in Cuba. I want to see Cuba free and happy and prosperous. I will vote for any measure to reduce the present tariff duties between this country and Cuba. In my judgment we should have free trade with Cuba. It would be beneficial to us and advantageous to the Cubans. It would help the people of both countries.

But I say now, and it must be apparent to anyone who gives the subject consideration, that if relief comes by tariff reduction the present duties must be reduced at least one-half. Anything less in this line will be useless and futile, and Cuba will go back to a condition of commercial stagnation that will cost us dearly in the end, and the fault will be all our own.

In the last three years the balance of trade has been over \$30,000,000 against the island. Her people have exhausted their resources in a heroic struggle to build up their industries, but they can not go on spending more than they receive any longer, and this year's sugar crop, which will be over 800,000 tons, represents their supreme effort, and unless relief comes—and comes quickly—we must expect a crisis which will render Cuba's position most deplorable and ours most embarrassing.

A mere handful of protected beet growers and cane growers, who care nothing for Cuba, nothing for the millions of American sugar consumers, are the only obstructors of this nation's good will to the people of Cuba. The American people expect Congress to grant relief, and to grant it quickly.

When the Congress adopted the so-called Platt amendment, which I voted against, and which in my judgment never should have been adopted, it took an unfair advantage of Cuba; but when that amendment finally became a law; the Cuban people accepted it in good faith, and, at our request, wrote it into their constitution. By virtue of that amendment Cuba is commercially helpless to-day, and unable to make treaties of a commercial character to market her products. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that it is now incumbent on this Government to grant some trade relief to Cuba by which her products can be admitted into this country and sold without a loss. At present this can not be done.

The cost of raising sugar in Cuba is 2.6 cents per pound. The selling price of sugar, duty paid, in New York is now 3.75 cents. The Dingley duty is 1.68½ cents per pound, or nearly 100 per cent of its value on the plantation in Cuba. It plainly appears, therefore, that Cuba can only sell her staple crop in New York at a loss, and

can not sell it anywhere else. There is now about \$20,000,000 worth of sugar cane standing in Cuba, and if the Dingley blockade against it is not raised it might as well be left to rot on the ground.

Governor-General Leonard Wood, pleading for a speedy reciprocal arrangement, insists that this country has nothing to lose and much to gain thereby. Our domestic production of sugar is about 450,000 tons; in the annexed and protected islands, Cuba included, about 1,000,000 tons more are grown, and from Europe we buy about 800,000 tons besides. One-fifth of all the sugar the American people use must come from outside. Cuba's total product, even if it were greatly increased, could not possibly make us independent of Europe.

Now, sir, if I could have my way regarding the matter I would strike down every tariff barrier between the Republic of Cuba and the United States. If something is not quickly done by Congress that will be the solution. The leaders of the Republican party have been quarreling day in and day out regarding this question. I am now informed and believe they have reached an agreement by which they are willing to reduce the existing tariff duties 20 per cent on sugar and tobacco. That according to the President, the Secretary of War, General Wood, President Palma, of the Cuban Republic, and others competent to testify, will do absolutely no good. If there is going to be any reduction of the tariff law, the reduction must be 50 per cent or more in order to help the Cubans.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a few words regarding my bill to remove the color restriction on unrefined sugar coming from Cuba. I introduced the bill in good faith, and I intend to do all in my power to pass it. It is a good bill, and should become a law. There should be no opposition to it, and to some extent it will solve the present difficulty by permitting the Cuban planters to market their unrefined sugar product immediately in this country. That will afford some relief at once.

If the color restriction on Cuban unrefined sugar should be removed, it would not materially injure the beet-sugar growers nor the cane-sugar growers of this country, but it would benefit immediately the Cuban planters and furnish to the people of this country cheaper and better sugar.

At present, on account of this color restriction, put in the law by the sugar trust, every pound of unrefined sugar that comes from Cuba to this country must be sold to the sugar trust, and it must be sold to the trust at the trust's own price. If this bill to remove that restriction should become a law, the Cuban sugar planters, if they were unable to sell to the sugar trust, could market their product and sell it to grocers and consumers in competition with the sugar trust.

The only legitimate opposition to this bill must therefore come from the sugar trust, in order to control the product, dictate the price, and stifle competition. When this question is understood, I am satisfied every friend of the people, every foe of monopoly, and every believer in commercial justice will favor the bill.

Now, sir, I do not say this bill is all that is necessary at the present time, but I do say, and I challenge successful contradiction, that it is a step in the right direction, and will afford immediate relief not only to the tariff-taxed Cuban producer, but also to the trust-taxed American consumer.

The color restriction on sugar is a device of the sugar trust and was put in the Dingley high protective tariff law at the instigation of the sugar trust, to give it a monopoly in this country on refined sugars. Remove the color restriction and the higher grade Cuban sugars can be put on the American market at once and sold in competition with the refined sugars of the trust.

At present the color restriction on sugar in the law forces the producers of Cuban sugar to sell to the trust at the price fixed by the trust, and compels the consumers in America to buy from the trust at the price dictated by the trust. The trust controls the product and fixes the price to suit itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get this matter before the House. I have done so briefly. At some future time I shall discuss this question more fully and at greater length. This color restriction for monopoly will have to go. The Republican party must repeal it or admit it stands for monopoly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

LIBERTY ENLIGHTENING THE WORLD.

I am a friend of liberty here and elsewhere.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

April 1, 1902.

WASHINGTON.

1902.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13123) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, after line 19, add:

"For the proper care and suitable lighting of the Liberty Light, in New York Harbor, \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, on the 1st day of March this year, by order of the Light-House Board, Liberty light, on Bedloe's Island, in the Harbor of New York, was extinguished. Just why the Light-House Board issued that order I know not, and no one whom I have talked to about it has been able to give to me a satisfactory explanation. In my opinion there is no good reason for that order. The light from Liberty's torch should not be put out. It is essential to commerce, but more than that, it represents a patriotic sentiment that should never be extinguished.

The great statue of Liberty Enlightening the World was unveiled on the 28th day of October, 1886. It was a splendid gift from the Republic of France to the Republic of the United States. It was intended to be a bond of sympathy, of fraternal feeling, of undying memories, of lasting friendship, of eternal good will between the two great Republics. It meant sympathy for republics and republican institutions all over the world. It glorified liberty, fortified freedom, and emphasized the rights of man. It was to be and it ever should be a great beacon light of democracy, dispelling the darkness of tyranny and welcoming to our hospitable shores the oppressed of every land. It was Bartholdi's apotheosis of liberty; a gift from the greatest Republic in Europe to the greatest Republic in all the world.

Its light should shine for all the ages. It should never go out while liberty lives in the breast of man. It links the past with the present, and should be prophetic of the future.

At the unveiling of that magnificent monument to liberty, the President of the United States, the Cabinet officers, distinguished members of Congress, members of the legislatures of States, mayors of cities, judges, governors, and leading citizens from all parts of the country were present. It was a "red-letter day" in the history of this Republic. There was music, and eloquence, and ceremony. It commemorated one of the great civic events in our annals. It was an imposing celebration, and the hand on the dial plate of time marked the hour of liberty and the freedom of man.

As such a beacon it has stood by day and shone by night.

It has meant much to us in many ways. It has stood for all the ideals of the Republic, and a bright harbinger to the weary immigrant after a tedious voyage. It has shone resplendent from the day it was unveiled until the 1st of last March, and then for some hidden reason this Administration, or the Light-House Board acting under this Administration, put out the light. What a commentary! In the face of what is now going on here, in the Orient, and elsewhere, how the eloquent words of the orators on that occasion mock us. What a difference between then and now! Things have changed.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offered should be adopted by the House. It should be incorporated into this bill without a dissenting vote. Patriotism prompts it, and we should see to it that the light of Liberty should burn as brightly as ever. I do not know how much money is necessary to clean the statue, fittingly care for it, and properly light it, but my amendment appropriates \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, gives the proper authorities discretion, and they will spend no more than is absolutely required. However, if the amount is objectionable, I will make it less. All I ask is to keep the light burning. That request should meet with no opposition from liberty-loving members of Congress.

It is a sad commentary, sir, on the Republic of to-day, a sad reflection on our professions and our glorious past, that the great light of Liberty has been put out. What does it mean? Will some one rise up and tell me? In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read at this time as a part of my remarks a poem regarding this matter, written by one of our popular poets and a well-known citizen of Washington, D. C.

Mr. MONDELL. This is not an original poem; the gentleman from New York did not write it himself?

Mr. SULZER. It is an original poem. I did not write it, and what is more, I know the gentleman from Wyoming could not write it. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

LIBERTY'S TORCH—OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENT.

LIGHT-HOUSE BOARD, TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D. C., February 12, 1902.

Liberty Enlightening the World light station. Notice is hereby given that on or about March 1, 1902, the fixed white electric light shown from the torch of the bronze statue on Bedloes Island, New York Bay, will be discontinued.

By order of the Light-House Board.

N. H. FARQUHAR,

Rear-Admiral, United States Navy

Put out the torch whose lustrous beams

Were lit at Freedom's council fires;

For in its flame no longer gleams

The lofty purpose of our sires.

When mouthing hypocrites efface

The noble charter of our rights

And set brute forces in its place,

Put out the signal lights!

Till our great armies cease to slay

And call the roll of Tagal dead,

Oh, let us shrink from light of day

And torch of night, and hang our head

Put out the lamp, lest it illumine

The path of our perfidious fame.

Put out the lamp, for in the gloom

We hide our scarlet shame!

Ah, when our tyrants quench in night
 The freedom of the Orient sea,
 Why should our goddess keep alight
 The beacon flame of Liberty?
 Silence the eagle on his crag!
 Hush holy Freedom's vaunting hymn!
 Drop down the mast the starry flag,
 And douse the harbor glim!

When patriots welter in their gore
 And perish where our squadrons press,
 Why set this flambeau on the shore
 To shine upon our wickedness?
 Ah, goddess! lift no trembling hand
 To light the bloody path of hate,
 But let grim darkness scowling stand
 And beckon at the gate!

W. A. CROFFUT

[Loud applause.]

Mr. SULZER. Now, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULZER. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, from the day this magnificent statue to liberty was unveiled down to March 1, this year, no Congress has failed to pass an appropriation for this light and to properly care for it.

Since 1886 it has been a light-house essential to commerce and safe navigation in the harbor of New York. It is on all the charts. It aids to mark the channel, and every mariner, every seafaring man, has looked for it and recognized it, going in or coming out of the magnificent harbor of New York. Why is it that after all this time this light must now go out? Is liberty dead? I hope not. I am a friend of liberty here and elsewhere. As a citizen of this Republic, I take a just pride in the grandeur of Liberty Enlightening the World and for all it typifies here and symbolizes to people in other lands. I would not darken its effulgent light, but I would make it burn brighter and brighter as the years come and go. It stands at the gates of America, a magnificent altar of man's faith in liberty, whose light should penetrate the darkness of tyranny throughout the world and guide men from oppression to the hospitable shores of freedom. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I feel deeply on this subject. The responsibility of putting out Liberty's torch must rest on the Republican party. This Administration, it seems to me, will be derelict to duty, false to all the Republic stands for, and recreant to the memories of a century and the sacred friendship of France, which has existed since our Revolutionary struggle, if we now permit that great statue of Liberty to stand in the darkness. What a flood of sentiment appeals to us in this matter. Can we so soon forget the past?

Is recollection dead and gratitude a dream? Are the words of the fathers a hollow mockery? Is our past a lie, or shall liberty truly enlighten the world? Let the gentleman from Illinois and the members of this House answer. I trust the response will be for liberty and in favor of continuing the light on Bedloe's Island, in favor of keeping that great statue of Liberty Enlightening the World illumined from sundown to sunrise, so that it will be not only a guide to mariners, but a great beacon of this Republic, and in truth for all liberty enlightening the world, beckoning

to our shores the downtrodden from every land and every clime.
[Applause.]

Yes, my friends, this bill should carry an appropriation to keep that torch of liberty burning. The people—the liberty-loving people—expect it. We must be true to ourselves—we must not disappoint them. The light must not go out. If it goes out now, it may go out forever.

But once put out thy light,
I know not where is that Promethean heat
That can thy light relume.

Now, sir, just a word more. I have offered this amendment in good faith, and in the name of liberty, in the name of this great Republic and all it stands for, by the memories of all the past, I trust, I hope, I pray, that it will be adopted, and that Liberty Enlightening the World will continue to shine for all mankind and be a beacon for freedom so long as this Republic shall endure.
[Loud applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman withdraw his amendment? [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman is trying to be facetious, but I sincerely trust he will not raise a point of order. If he stands for liberty, if he believes in republican institutions, if he glories in the greatness and the honor of this Republic, he surely will not object to the amendment. Of course I will not withdraw it.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I have enjoyed the gentleman's speech very greatly. I am quite sure the Committee of the Whole House has, and having had the opportunity to make a speech and having made it so well, it was in the greatest good faith that I asked him if he withdrew his amendment, but he says not. It seems to me that having made the speech he ought to withdraw it. If he will not, however, I want to again express my admiration of his speech, including the peroration.

Mr. MANN. And the poetry.

Mr. CANNON. And the poetry, too; but if we must get down to cold facts about it, I must state there are \$1,900,000 in the bill in connection with the Light-House Service for lights, and the Light-House Board has complete discretion in maintaining the service to light this particular light, as well as all others, and we made some inquiry about it. Somebody suggested, Why do you keep that light burning in that great work that was given to us? Well, the reply come in that commerce does not need it; commerce is not benefited by it.

Mr. SULZER. And the Republican party does not need it.

Mr. CANNON. You know, we spend some money; we believe, of course, at times in the old flag and in an appropriation. We are spending some money at New York Harbor. We are making another channel there—40 or 45 feet, which is it to be, when complete?

* * * * *

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, just a few words in reply to the gentleman from Illinois. He says that there is in this bill a large appropriation for light-houses. It is true the bill carries a general appropriation for light-houses. And, sir, I am willing to take the gentleman at his word. I trust he is sincere and is not begging the question. I am willing now to withdraw this amendment if the gentleman will agree to insert in this bill what I be-

lieve has always been in it before—that is, since 1886—a provision that the Light-House Board, or the War Department, whichever has authority in the matter, shall see to it that this statue of Liberty Enlightening the World is properly cared for and lighted, as has been done heretofore. That is all I want. That is all the people, who take a pride in this matter, desire. Will the gentleman consent to it?

Mr. CANNON. Now, let me say to my friend right there, there never has been a specific appropriation to keep this light burning in this statue.

Mr. SULZER. Well, then, that is all the more reason why it should be in now. Why should an irresponsible board have the right to say arbitrarily the torch of Liberty must be put out?

Mr. CANNON. Let me complete my statement. If it is necessary or proper for commerce, then there are nearly \$2,000,000 available for that and other purposes. I do not want to assent to a legislative direction to keep that light burning. On the contrary, if the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of War exercised a discretion to spend \$50,000 for keeping this light burning when it did not aid commerce one iota, I should be in favor of passing a resolution of censure upon such Secretary, because it would be an unwarranted waste of public money.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, just a moment. The gentleman says this amendment carries \$50,000. It is true the amendment says \$50,000, but the gentleman fails to state what the amendment also says—" \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary"—and I am willing to reduce it to meet the views of the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is so in all matters of appropriation.

Mr. SULZER. If \$50,000 is too much, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Treasury can see to it that only enough is expended to light the statue properly, or I will make it five thousand or ten thousand dollars now. The gentleman from Illinois says commerce does not need this light. I differ from him. For the last fifteen years it has been a beacon and an aid to commerce. It is marked on every chart of New York Harbor. It is for commerce a light-house. It is looked for by every ship coming in or going out of the harbor, and it is just as essential to commerce as any other light-house in New York Bay. No shipping concern, no commercial body has asked to have the light extinguished. On the contrary, commerce demands that this light shall continue to shine.

Mr. LESSLER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SULZER. Certainly.

Mr. LESSLER. I should like to know where you get your information about that.

Mr. SULZER. I get my information from the same source that you can if you look for it—the newspapers.

Mr. LESSLER. Well, I have looked it up—

Mr. SULZER. I get it from the daily newspapers of New York City. I get it from mariners who reside in New York. I get it from commercial bodies—

Mr. LESSLER. In your district?

Mr. SULZER. I get it from the pilot associations in New York City; consult these sources of information. This light, aside from any patriotic sentiment, is just as necessary as a light-house

as any other light-house. There are half a dozen light-houses in New York Bay, and this is one of them, and it is just as important as the others. This appropriation, consequently, should be made, or there should be some provision in the bill directing the proper authority, whether it is the Light-House Board or the Secretary of War, to see to it that Liberty Enlightening the World is properly illuminated. That is all I wish to say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois, and I trust the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SULZER) there were—ayes 43, noes 33.

Mr. CANNON. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. CANNON and Mr. SULZER.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 61, noes 67.

YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK.



S P E E C H

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

April 2, 1902.



WASHINGTON.

1902:

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House having under consideration the following provision in the sundry civil bill:

"Improvement of the Yellowstone National Park: For the improvement of the Yellowstone National Park, in accordance with the approved project, including the maintenance of existing improvements, to be expended by and under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$250,000, to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such labor and materials as may be necessary for the completion of the project, including annual maintenance and repairs, or the work may be done and the materials purchased otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in any one year \$250,000, and not to exceed in the aggregate \$500,000, exclusive of the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated: *And provided further*, That of the amounts so appropriated not to exceed \$50,000 may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be expended in the Yellowstone Forest Reserve east of the park, and not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended in the Yellowstone and Teton Forest Reserves south of the park"—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is a matter of much personal gratification to me to find in this sundry civil bill a liberal appropriation for the proper care and the immediate and continued improvement of our great national park. The people familiar with this subject will approve this provision now, and posterity, which will realize more fully its benefits, will commend us for our foresight and judgment in a spirit of eternal gratitude. This money will be well and wisely spent, and its expenditure will create lasting results that will please, instruct, and benefit humanity for ages yet to come.

Mr. Chairman, Yellowstone Park is the world's wonderland. It beggars description. The most eloquent tongue fails to describe its surpassing wonders, and the gifted pen of the most imaginative poet can not adequately picture the infinite variety of its sublime realities. After you have read and heard all that mortal man can say, you must see it yourself to fully appreciate all its glories and startling revelations. It never palls; the eye never tires. From the time you leave Livingston until you return, the scenery is an inspiration and simply indescribable. It is one grand

panorama of loveliness beyond comparison, a symphony of colors, a combination of architectural miracles.

Take it all in all, Yellowstone Park is the greatest, the grandest, the most picturesque, and the most marvelous picture in nature's art gallery—painted in all the radiant colors of the rainbow by the unerring, heroic hand of the Infinite—sculptured by the Supreme Creator of the universe—a testifying demonstration that the Great Jehovah liveth.

The establishment of this magnificent park, to be forever safe from the destroying vandal, and sacred for all time from the devastating hand of greedy commercialism, does great credit to the farseeing statesmanship of the men who conceived it, and to those who are now faithfully executing a great trust for the benefit of millions yet unborn.

This national park was dedicated to humanity. It belongs to the people. It is sacred to nature. No vandal must ever be permitted to desecrate it. Every citizen of the Republic should behold its glories and witness the beauties of nature's most perfect picture. I hope more people every year will visit this inspiring park, and I know they will go away benefited in mind and body. As the years come and go it will become more and more a sanitarium for the afflicted, an art gallery for the lovers of the beautiful, a Bohemia for the lotus-eating dreamers of the Better Day, and a great national playground, the recreation place of millions of the citizens of the Republic, where the rich and the poor, the great and the small shall have an equal right to enjoy and commune with nature in her primeval wonders and in all her pristine glories.

The provisions in this bill for Yellowstone Park are made, I am informed, in accordance with the recommendations of Capt. Hiram N. Chittenden, a distinguished officer in the Engineer Corps of the Army, now detailed to the park and in charge of the improvements. He is beyond all question the right man in the right place. He has done and is doing a great work, not sufficiently appreciated, perhaps, by the unthinking and the casual observer, but the work itself will be his lasting monument, and the consciousness of duty well done for duty's sake will be his greatest reward.

I visited the park last summer, saw for myself, and speak from

personal knowledge. Every member of Congress should uphold the hands of Captain Chittenden, and all his commendable efforts should be encouragingly sustained by the Government. I am and ever will be a friendly advocate of Yellowstone Park, and in or out of Congress I will always do all in my power for its best interests; and I am glad in this connection to pay a just and merited tribute to the genius of gallant Captain Chittenden.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a few words more. In my opinion the western boundary of the park should be extended to include Jackson Lake, the Teton Mountains, and the domain sometimes called the Hole in the Wall. Every disinterested person with whom I have talked concerning this matter has concurred in this conclusion. Aside from the beauties of the natural scenery of this adjoining land to the park, it is of great importance that it should be incorporated into the park for the reason that the wild animals, especially the deer, the elk, and the buffalo, roam there from the park during certain seasons of the year, and hunters lying in wait slaughter them remorselessly.

This is a shame and should be stopped, and the best way to do it is by an extension of the park's boundary. It will cost little to do this now, and in my judgment Yellowstone Park will ere long become the last place in this country where the wild game—the big game—can live out their natural lives unmolested by the barbarian pot-hunter and the semicivilized sportsman. Every loyal friend of the national park and every true friend of our wild animals should favor this extension of the boundary of Yellowstone Park. It should be acted on now. No time should be lost.

This additional territory can be obtained to-day by the United States Government very cheaply, and it ought to be taken in before its value increases.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I trust the provision in this bill for Yellowstone Park will be passed without modification. It is truly in the interest of the people, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in my judgment, is entitled to much commendation and the thanks of the American people for his broadminded statesmanship in the matter. [Applause.]

STATUES TO GENERALS PULASKI AND STEUBEN.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, July 1, 1902.

WASHINGTON.

1902.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

A bill to provide for the erection of a bronze equestrian statue to the memory of the late Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski at Washington, D. C.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose indicated, be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended for the erection of a suitable bronze equestrian statue of the late Brig. Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski, of Poland, who came to America and, after declaring his intention to become a citizen of the Republic, offered his sword to Washington, under whose leadership in the great struggle for American independence he lost his life at the siege of Savannah, Ga., October 11, 1779.

SEC. 2. That a site for said statue shall be selected by a committee consisting of the Secretary of War, the chairmen of the Committees on the Library of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the representatives of the Polish-American organizations in the Pulaski monument movement at Washington, D. C., and that no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be expended until a suitable site at Washington, D. C., for the erection of said equestrian statue shall have been selected.

SEC. 3. That the above-designated committee shall select and approve the model and plans for said statue and have general supervision of the erection thereof: *Provided*, That the money hereby appropriated shall be drawn upon the requisition of the Secretary of War.

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to be heard on this matter. I desire to say that I am very much in favor of the passage of this bill to erect in the city of Washington an equestrian statue to the memory of Casimir Pulaski, but I understood that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] intended to offer another bill as an amendment to this bill to build a similar statue to the memory of Baron Steuben. Both of these bills have been unanimously reported by the Committee on the Library. I think they ought to go together.

It will be fitting and proper. Steuben and Pulaski were great heroes and rendered invaluable service to the American cause during the Revolutionary war. If the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] does not offer the amendment I shall, and I hope the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRICK] will accept it. If he does, I believe they will pass together unanimously. I am as much in favor of one as I am of the other. The merits of each are about the same. They fought for the same cause, under similar circumstances, and their monuments should go up together at the same time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words, and pay my humble tribute to the memory of both of these distinguished heroes of our Revolutionary struggle. It is fitting that this should be done. They both deserve to have statues in this city.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI.

Monuments, sir, have been erected by vote of Congress in the city of Washington to many of the great Revolutionary heroes of this country. And among those that served America in the darkest days of the Revolution Casimir Pulaski figures as one of

the most distinguished officers and martyrs. But no statue to the memory of Pulaski, his noble deeds and high-minded patriotism, appears here, although it should have been one of the first statues erected in Washington. It is a legacy bequeathed to us by the Continental Congress.

Away back in November, 1779, the Continental Congress, upon receiving notification of the death of General Pulaski through Major-General Lincoln, passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That a monument be erected to the memory of Brigadier-General Count Pulaski, and that a committee of three be appointed to bring in a resolution for that purpose.

This resolution was never acted on, and it has come to the Congress of the United States as a sacred obligation from the Continental Congress. We should act on it without further delay.

We have erected in Jackson Park, fronting the White House, a statue to General Lafayette. That statue occupies a prominent corner. On the other corner we have just unveiled a magnificent statue to General Rochambeau, and the two remaining corners of that park should be graced with the statues of General Pulaski and General Steuben. I hope this course will be followed. It would be, it seems to me, entirely proper and exceedingly consistent.

General Pulaski was born in Poland in 1747. As a mere lad he fought in his native country until its downfall, and then came to America to take up again the battle for liberty, until he fell at the siege of Savannah, on October 9, 1779. Many of his countrymen by birth have, like Pulaski, immigrated to America to make this their home, and their numbers now are in the millions. They have been asking for the erection of this statue to their countryman, and many petitions have been received by Congress, urging that some action be taken on this bill to erect to his memory a suitable statue.

He deserves it. He was a lover of mankind, a friend of human freedom, and a believer in the rights of man. He was a brave soldier, a gallant officer, and he fought at home and here for liberty. He was one of the heroes of the revolution, and he died for American independence. What he did for liberty will live forever.

He deserves this statue to perpetuate his memory among the people he helped to make free and for whom he sacrificed his life on the battlefield. It can be said of him and of his tragic death what a great poet has said of the sad death of his illustrious countryman—to paraphrase the couplet—

Hope for a season bade the patriots farewell,
And Freedom shriek'd when Pulaski fell.

GEN. FREDERICK STEUBEN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words regarding General Steuben and the bill to erect a statue to his memory. A century and a quarter have passed since Baron Steuben, as he is more frequently called, came to America and offered his services to the struggling colonists.

He was duly commissioned a general in the Revolutionary Army and rendered incalculable service during that protracted and sanguinary struggle. American history does not give him the place he is entitled to and should occupy. Our Government has done practically nothing to testify its appreciation of the great work he performed in the days that tried men's souls.

Perhaps this is because he did not assume the commanding position of other more dashing Revolutionary generals. Steuben was a soldier. He drilled and disciplined the ragged Army of the colonists. He worked behind the scenes, but the work he did was of the utmost importance, and made it possible for the Continental Army to cope with the disciplined and experienced soldiers of England and win American independence.

The career of General Steuben is a most interesting and absorbing history of an exciting life. He was born November 15, 1730, at Magdeburg, a large Prussian fortress on the Elbe. At that time his father was captain in the Prussian engineers, and when he was called to service in the Crimea the son accompanied him. In 1740 he returned with his father to Prussia. In 1744, when scarcely 14 years of age, during the war of the Austrian Succession, he was present at the siege of Prague. Thus from his earliest years Steuben was familiar with soldiers and things pertaining to war.

In the Seven Years' War so greatly did he distinguish himself that he attracted the attention of Frederick the Great, who appointed Steuben aid-de-camp on his personal staff. He was one of six talented young officers whom the King personally instructed and initiated into the most abstruse branches of military art. The distinction of being thus chosen is convincing proof of Steuben's merit and promise. With Frederick the Great neither high birth nor family influence had any weight in the selection of his military favorites; talent and fitness were the only recommendation to favor.

In 1764, having resigned from the service of Prussia, Steuben accepted the office of grand marshal of the court of the Prince of Hohenzollern-Hechingen, the honorable and responsible duties of which he discharged with great credit for some ten years. For some years the dignified tranquillity of court life furnished agreeable repose for him, tired as he was of the bivouac and the camp. But it could not satisfy his ardent and impetuous temperament or induce him to renounce the active duties from which for a season he had withdrawn. So he began to look around for a fitting opportunity to reenter active military service.

He left Europe, where he had won hard-earned distinction and fame—where if he was not opulent he had at least a sufficient competence—to serve a country engaged in an obstinate, exhausting, and hitherto unsuccessful war, where his prospects of professional advancement were by no means assured, and which offered no inducements of a pecuniary or material nature. Confident in himself, urged by high and generous motives, he determined to offer his sword to a people struggling for their rights and liberties. He made no conditions. He bargained for no reward.

Arriving at Portsmouth, N. H., on the first day of December, 1777, Steuben, on December 6, wrote to the Continental Congress a letter which is worthy of being quoted here in its entirety, as illustrating the spirit of the man. It was as follows:

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: The honor of serving a nation engaged in defending its rights and liberties was the motive that brought me to this continent. I ask neither riches nor titles. I am come here from the remotest end of Germany, at my own expense, and have given up honorable and lucrative rank. I have made no condition with your deputies in France, nor shall I make any with you. My only ambition is to serve you as a volunteer, to deserve the confidence of your General-in-Chief, and to follow him in all his operations as I have done during seven campaigns with the King of Prussia.

Two and twenty years spent in such a school seems to give me a right of thinking myself among the number of experienced officers, and if I am possessed of the acquirements in the art of war they will be much more prized by me if I can employ them in the service of a republic such as I hope soon to see America. I should willingly purchase at the expense of my blood the honor of having my name enrolled among those of the defenders of your liberty. Your gracious acceptance will be sufficient for me, and I ask no other favor than to be received among your officers. I venture to hope that you will grant this my request, and that you will be so good as to send me your orders to Boston, where I shall await them and take suitable measures in accordance.

In a letter to Washington, of the same date, he said:

SIR: The inclosed copy of a letter, the original of which I shall have the honor to present to Your Excellency, will inform you of the motives that brought me over to this land. I shall only add to it that the object of my greatest ambition is to render the country all the service in my power, and to deserve the title of a citizen of America by fighting for the cause of your liberty. If the distinguished ranks in which I have service in Europe should be an obstacle, I had rather serve under Your Excellency as a volunteer than to be an object of discontent to such deserving officers as have already distinguished themselves among you.

Such being the sentiments I have always professed, I dare hope that the respectable Congress of the United States of America will accept my services. I could say, moreover, were it not for the fear of offending your modesty, that Your Excellency is the only person under whom, after having served the King of Prussia, I could wish to follow a profession to the study of which I have wholly devoted myself. I intend to go to Boston in a few days, where I shall present my letters to Mr. Hancock, member of Congress, and there I shall await Your Excellency's orders.

At Boston Steuben was entertained by John Hancock, who had just retired from the presidency of the Continental Congress, and here, after waiting five weeks, he received Washington's answer to his letter. It advised him to report at once to Congress, then sitting at York, Pa., since it belonged exclusively to that body to enter into negotiations with him.

The fame of Steuben had preceded him to York and he was cordially received by Congress. A committee of three members was appointed to confer with him and ascertain the conditions on which he was willing to serve the United States, and whether he had made any arrangements with the American deputies in France.

He said that he had made no agreement with them, nor was it his intention to accept any rank or pay; that he wished to join the Army as a volunteer, and to render such services as the Commander in Chief should think him capable of. The Continental Congress, through its president, Mr. Laurens, accepted his generous proposition and directed him to report to General Washington at Valley Forge. Here Steuben began a work the value of which can scarcely be overestimated.

He made the patriotic army a disciplined and effective force—the drilled corps that ultimately won the war for freedom. He worked incessantly to do this under the greatest difficulties and most adverse circumstances, but he succeeded, and the credit for it is all his own. American history some day will do him full justice and give him a high place in our temple of fame.

On the 30th of April, 1778, about six weeks after Steuben had commenced his active duties, Washington made the following report to Congress:

The extensive ill consequences arising from a want of uniformity in discipline and maneuvers throughout the Army have long occasioned me to wish for the establishment of a well-organized inspectorship, and the concurrence of Congress in the same views has induced me to set on foot a temporary institution, which, from the success which has hitherto attended it, gives me the most flattering expectations.

Baron Steuben's length of service in the first military school of Europe

and his former rank pointed him out as a person peculiarly qualified to be at the head of this department. This appeared the least exceptionable way of introducing him into the Army, and the one that would give him the most ready opportunity of displaying his talent. I therefore proposed to him to undertake the office of Inspector-General, which he agreed to do with the greatest cheerfulness, and has performed the duties of it with a zeal and intelligence equal to our wishes.

I should do injustice if I were to be longer silent with regard to the merits of Baron Steuben. His knowledge of his profession, added to the zeal which he has displayed since he began upon the functions of his office, leads me to consider him an acquisition to the service, and to recommend him to the attention of Congress.

The "recommendation" of Washington was that Steuben be made Inspector-General of the American Army with the rank of major-general. The recommendation of Washington was followed by Congress, and by act of May 5, 1778, Steuben was created a major-general and assigned to the duties of Inspector-General of the Army.

Mr. Speaker, such in brief is the story of General Steuben, one of the bravest and most invaluable officers of the Continental Army. He served throughout the Revolutionary war and was of inestimable service to Washington, who never failed to testify to his abilities and the great work he had done in the cause of American independence.

When peace came and the United States had taken her place among the nations of the world, this battle-scarred veteran—grand old General Steuben—who had been a tower of strength to George Washington from Valley Forge to Yorktown, quietly resigned his commission in the Army of the United States and retired to a log hut in the backwoods of the State of New York—away from the crowded marts of trade and the peopled thoroughfares of towns and cities—to live and die in peace.

He rendered great service to this country in its most trying hour, in the darkest days of its struggle for independence, and in his name, in the name of all that he did and accomplished, in the name of the Continental Congress, in the name of honor and gratitude, I appeal to every member of this House to vote for this bill to erect to his memory a fitting statue to commemorate his heroic deeds and to perpetuate forever his imperishable glory.
[Applause.]

THE POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, June 24, 1902.

WASHINGTON.

1902.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 2235) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A few days ago I was astonished by the attack made upon the postal employees, and particularly on the letter carriers of the country, by the chairman of the Post-Office and Post-Roads Committee [Mr. LOUD]. The thought came to me at that time that if an opportunity presented itself something should be said in refutation of those statements. The time has come, in my opinion, when some one should tell the truth in respect to one who has been a consistent opponent of every effort to increase the wages of the postal employees, but who has just as persistently labored in behalf of the great railroad corporations who have been the beneficiaries of his acts.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether the letter carriers are being used as a shield behind which we find hidden the railroads of the country which are getting the lion's share of the appropriations annually made to carry on the work of the Post-Office Department? I ask why it is that this House continually accepts the report of the Committee on Post-Offices, made by its chairman, by which we are paying the railroads fully as much and more in rentals per year than it costs to build the cars which we are renting? May I further ask, if in order to keep this from the members of the House, and in order to throw sand in our eyes, the statement is being made that we must keep down expenses by restricting or resisting these assaults on the Treasury that are being made by the employees of the postal service, especially the letter carriers? May I ask whether this is a subterfuge merely, in order to keep from us the real issue, which is the payment of ten times as much

for handling or carrying the mails as is paid for carrying express matter in the same cars, behind the same engines, on the same train, and over the same roadbed?

When the chairman of the Post-Office Committee took occasion to belittle the efforts of the letter carriers he only followed out his former tactics. Not only that, his remarks were in line with his attempts to reduce the price of labor, to lower the standards of wages, and to add to the profits of contractors, as we well remember was his aim when he desired to place the rural free-delivery service on a contract basis. Oh, this contract system must certainly be a grand one! It reminds me of the padrones, who hire boys and peddle them out and utilize their services for a mere pittance while they themselves grow rich. Has it come to a point where this country must require men to take civil-service examinations, to furnish bonds, and to do labor in order to be farmed out to contractors?

I believe that were a bill introduced in this House asking that the letter carriers be placed on the contract basis such bill would speedily be reported to the House and passed. But a just measure, the purpose of which is to give relief to a deserving body of men, is pigeon-holed simply because, under the rules, the chairman can take such action. Well and eloquently did the president of the carriers' organization plead with the committee to bring the bill into the House, or at least to make a report at this session, favorably or otherwise, for I know, as every member knows, that once brought into the House justice will be done and the bill passed.

But, no; it is the will of the chairman that such should not be done. It is not my purpose now to speak at length, or to touch largely upon the letter carriers' salary bill. I have done that heretofore, but I simply desire at this time to point out why it is, to my mind, that the efforts of the railway mail clerks, the post-office clerks, and the letter carriers are always being made the chief issue in this House by those who have charge of the work of the Post-Office Committee. In studying the situation, in looking over this matter, in weighing the question, I can arrive at no other conclusion than that it is intended as a sort of a yell of "stop thief," and thus keep the members of this House agitated on this

question, while the chairman quietly sits back and fixes up the bills by which the railroads get enormous amounts of money from the public Treasury.

I want to say right here, Mr. Chairman, that were the Government to pay the railroads what is a fair price for handling mail in transit instead of the present exorbitant rates, which are fixed by action of this committee, under the advisement of its chairman—that were this done we could extend the postal service beyond anything that was ever dreamed of in this country. We could then pay the employees decent wages. We would then not be treated to the spectacle of having to compare their salaries with those of the poverty-ridden workers of the State of Pennsylvania, which is controlled from top to bottom by these very railroads who are getting these vast amounts of money on their mail contracts.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that were these rates that are being paid the railroads for carrying the mails fixed at a reasonable figure we could extend the free-delivery service to every hamlet, to every farmhouse, to every nook and corner of this country. Not only that, but 1-cent postage would then be reached. But no; for fear that we may examine into this matter and that we may accidentally discover what is the real drain on our Treasury, who is the real dog whose tail should be cut off behind the ears—yes, lest we might discover this, we are continually told to watch the postal clerks, to watch the railway-mail clerks, and to watch the letter carriers, for fear that they might impoverish us should we give them sufficient to allow them to live.

The thought struck me, in listening to the argument of my colleague from California [Mr. LOUD], that if substitutes earn \$380 per year, where does this money come from? I believe—in fact, I know—that the money that substitutes earn is deducted from the salary of the regular carriers. If substitutes earn \$380 per year, then the regular carriers must certainly be \$380 per year short, except, perhaps, the small pittance which is allowed the substitutes by appropriation for serving the routes of regular carriers during the vacation period. I ask again, Why is it the gentleman from California, in comparing the salaries of carriers with those of other employees, takes on the one hand, every per-

son who could be designated as an employee in a certain given industry—whether he happens to be a skilled mechanic or only a common laborer—and by adding them all together averages up their pay to bring it down to as low a figure as possible; while, on the other hand, in the carrier service he takes 20 of the largest cities and tries to show that the amount received by regulars or substitutes in these 20 large cities holds good from Maine to California?—

Mr. Chairman, there are over 900 cities in the United States, and there are but 53 or 55 cities in which carriers receive nominally \$1,000 per year, and in all the other 850 or more cities the maximum salary which any letter carrier can receive is \$850. We have hundreds of post-offices which employ only 3 or 4 carriers each. If the substitute earns \$380 in any of these offices, \$380 must necessarily come from the 4 carriers in the office having that number, and \$100 will be the amount that this substitute receives for serving routes during vacation. This would leave the salary or the income of the carriers in such an office about \$775 or \$780 per year.

From this they also buy their uniforms, which further reduces the net dollars and cents to which my worthy colleague from California is so prone to call attention. Every statement that he makes could be refuted, but I do not wish to take up the time of this body further than to show that it is not the letter carriers that we must fear—that it is not the salary that they receive or ask for that will bankrupt this country—but that it is the amount that is fixed annually by appropriations contained in the Post-Office bill to subsidize the railroads that is the real drain. Just as my colleague says, I ask you to study this question, to judge it calmly and dispassionately, and I believe that you will find that instead of attacking the letter carriers more good would come to this country and more money would be saved the Treasury if you would examine a little more closely into the methods that are pursued, not by the letter carriers, but by the railroads, who seem to get everything they want from the Post-Office Committee.

We do not hear of bills for railway mail contracts slumbering in the pigeon-holes of the committee. We do not hear any reference made to the amounts that are handed out annually

on a platter in the form of subsidies. We hear little or no reference to such things. And why, Mr. Chairman, are these matters pushed through so quietly? Is it fear that should they be discussed that this House might examine a little more closely into this question and find that they are paying for something they do not get? Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that in the future I shall watch these matters more closely, and that when attacks are made on the workers in the ranks I will endeavor to ascertain who is the gentleman in the woodpile that you are protecting by throwing stones at some one on the outside. I serve notice here and now, Mr. Chairman, that the grasp which these corporations have on the country and on its resources will ere long be broken.

The people demand publicity regarding the Trusts. The Republicans talk in favor of publicity but vote against it. The Democrats vote as they talk. The record speaks for itself.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 17, 1903.

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I now offer the amendment which I ask the Clerk to read. I propose that it come in as section 6.

Mr. CORLISS. I make the point that the sixth section has not yet been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that section 6 has not yet been read.

Mr. SULZER. This is designed to follow section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman offers it as a new section.

Mr. SULZER. Yes, sir.

The Clerk proceeded to read the following amendment proposed by Mr. SULZER:

SEC. 6. That there shall be established in the department of commerce and labor a bureau called the bureau of corporations, and a chief of said bureau, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive a salary of \$4,000 per annum. There shall also be in said bureau one chief clerk and one auditor and such number of examiners as shall be needed to carry out the purposes of this act. Said auditor and examiners shall be expert accountants, and shall be paid salary and necessary expenses. There shall also be such other clerical assistants as may from time to time be authorized by Congress. It shall be the province and duty of said bureau of corporations, under the direction of the secretary of commerce and labor, to inspect and examine all corporations engaged in interstate or foreign commerce by gathering, compiling, publishing, and supplying all available and useful information concerning such corporations, including the manner in which their business is conducted, and by such other methods and means as may be prescribed by the said secretary. Every corporation governed by this act shall make annual reports in writing to the said auditor of said bureau, and such report shall in all cases include:

(a) Capital authorized and issued; the amount paid up in cash or otherwise, with a statement of the method of paying where it is not in cash.

(b) Debts, including details as to the amount thereof and security given therefor, if any.

(c) Obligations due from officers, which shall be separately stated.

(d) A statement of assets and the method of valuing the same, whether at cost price, by appraisal, or otherwise, and of the allowance made for depreciation. Small items of personal property included in a plant may be described by the term "sundries" or like general term.

(e) Gross earnings for the period covered by the report, all deductions necessary for interest, taxes, and expense of all sorts, the surplus available for dividends, and dividends actually declared.

(f) Increase of assets since the last statement, with a showing in what way such increase has been secured.

(g) The names and addresses of stockholders, with the number of shares held by each at the date of the report.

(h) The amount of stock disposed of and the amount of property taken for stock sold since the last report, with all facts necessary to show the results of the transaction.

(i) A statement showing that the corporation in question has not, during the period covered by the said report, received any rebates, drawbacks, special rates or discriminations, advantages or preferences, by money pay-

ments or otherwise, from any railroad, pipe line, water carrier, or other transportation company, or if any such have been received or given, stating when, from whom, on what account, and in what manner they were so received, with all other details necessary to a full understanding of the transaction or transactions.

(j) The names and addresses of all officers; location of transfer or registry offices, wherever located.

(k) A statement that the corporation has not fixed prices, or done any other act with a view to restricting trade or driving any competitor out of business.

(l) A statement that the corporation is or is not a party to any contract, combination, or conspiracy in the form of trust or otherwise in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or Territories or with foreign nations.

(m) A statement of the proportion of goods going into interstate commerce.

That it shall be the duty of the auditor to prescribe the form of the reports before mentioned. He may in his discretion require additional reports at any time when he may see fit, upon reasonable notice; but his determination shall be prima facie proof that the notice is reasonable. He may also require supplemental reports whenever, in his judgment, the report rendered is in any particular or particulars insufficient, evasive, or ambiguous. He may prescribe rules so as to avoid undue detail in making reports, but no detail of the business of the corporation shall be considered private so as to be exempt from the examination of the auditor whenever he may demand report thereon. He shall make public in his reports, which shall be issued annually, all the information contained in the reports so made to him. When a report has been made by a corporation, and, with all supplemental and additional reports required by the auditor, shall have been approved by him, the corporation making such report or reports shall publish the same in a daily newspaper, after the usual custom in such cases, with the auditor's minutes of approval, and shall file with the auditor proof of such publication by the publisher's certificate.

That if any corporation shall fail to make a report when required, either by the terms of this act or when required by the auditor, as herein provided, said corporation shall be fined not less than 1 per cent or not more than 10 per cent of its last annual gross earnings for each offense. Every day of failure after a written demand has been made by the auditor shall constitute a separate and distinct offense. In case of failure, also, each of the directors of the said corporation shall be ineligible, for the year succeeding the next annual meeting, to hold either directorship or any other office in the said corporation. If such report is false in any material respect, the corporation shall be fined not less than 2 per cent and not more than 20 per cent of its last annual gross earnings, and each false statement in any material matter shall constitute a separate offense. All fines and penalties imposed by this act shall be recovered or enforced in any court of competent jurisdiction.

That it shall be the duty of examiners, under the direction of the auditor, to make examinations of any corporation governed by this act. Any said examiners presenting his official credentials shall be furnished by the officers of the corporation every facility for complete and full examination, not only of the books, but of all property, records, or papers of the corporation which may be necessary, in the judgment of the examiner, for a complete knowledge of the affairs of the concern. Such examinations shall not be at fixed periods, but shall be at such times as the auditor shall fix and without notice. Examiners shall have the power to examine under oath all officers or employees of a corporation, or any other persons having any knowledge of its affairs, and to send for, demand, and inspect books, papers, and any other matter of evidence whatever which is in the possession or control of the said corporation. For the purpose of this act examiners shall have power to require, by subpoena, the attendance and testimony of witnesses under oath and the production of all books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents relating to any matter under investigation. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. And in case of disobedience to a subpoena the examiner may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring such attendance.

And any of the circuit courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any corporation subject to the provisions of this act, or other person, issue an order requiring such corporation or other person to appear before said examiner and produce books and papers, if so ordered, and give evidence touching the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The claim that any such testimony or evidence may tend to criminate the person giving such evidence or testimony shall not be used against such person on the trial of any criminal proceeding. The auditor shall like-

wise have all the authority of an examiner in any case wherein he chooses himself to act. No examiner shall be assigned to examine any corporation who is himself interested in the business thereof, or any competing concern, or who has relatives who are so interested.

That it shall be unlawful for an examiner to divulge private business, except by his report to the auditor. But such report, or the substance thereof, shall be opened for public inspection. Each examiner shall follow the rules, regulations, and directions which the auditor may from time to time lay down or communicate to him as to the method of examination, the form of report, the matters to be covered by the said examination, and all matters pertaining to his duties. Said examinations and reports shall always cover, among others, the following questions:

(a) Has the said corporation, during the period covered by the examination and report, received any rebates, drawbacks, special rates, or other discriminations, advantages, or preferences, by money payments or otherwise, from any railroad, pipe line, water carrier, or other transportation company?

(b) If there have been such preferences, when were they received, from whom, on what account, and in what manner, giving all details necessary to a full understanding of the transaction?

(c) Is the said corporation a member of any combination having or intending to secure a monopoly of any commodity other than such monopolies as are legally granted by patent or otherwise?

(d) Has the said corporation any such monopoly, or does it use methods tending to secure such monopoly?

(e) Has it made any contracts or agreements tending to secure any such monopoly to itself or any other concern, whether owned by an individual or individuals, a corporation, or some combination of individuals and corporations?

(f) Is such corporation a party to any contract, agreement, or combination, in the form of a trust or otherwise, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations?

(g) Has the corporation purchased or does it hold the stock of any corporation for the purpose of controlling its management?

Said reports of examiners shall be *prima facie* true and may be introduced in evidence in all courts to prove the facts therein set forth. Copies certified by the auditor shall be admissible with like effect and under the same circumstances as the original. The word "corporation" wherever used in this act shall be deemed to include associations existing or authorized either by the law of the United States, the laws of any State, or the laws of any foreign country.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, regarding this amendment I want to say that on the 2d day of May, 1902, I introduced in this House a bill to establish a department of commerce, and the amendment just read is section 5 of that bill. The bill was referred to and considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I appeared before that committee in favor of my bill to establish a department of commerce, and so did a number of distinguished gentlemen representing commercial bodies, labor organizations, the American Anti-Trust League, and other associations which are in favor of publicity in regard to the great trusts of our land.

All of these gentlemen advocated my bill or the incorporation in the department of commerce bill of a provision similar to the amendment just offered by me. The committee did not see fit to do that. They left it out of the bill they reported and now before the House. I simply ask at this time to have that amendment read, so that every member and the country may understand it. I ask now unanimous consent to have it considered as pending, so that the members of the House may have an opportunity to read it in the RECORD to-morrow.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, that goes into the RECORD.

Mr. SULZER. I know it does, but I want it pending for a time to give members a chance to read and study it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman asked to have it be considered as pending.

Mr. SULZER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as pending, so that members can read it in the RECORD and vote on it intelligently.

The CHAIRMAN. To be voted upon after the reading of the bill is concluded?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; that is my request.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state the request. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the amendment which he has offered may be considered as pending, to be voted upon when the reading of the bill is concluded. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, to what portion of the bill is the amendment offered?

The CHAIRMAN. It is offered as a separate section.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman can offer his amendment at the proper place at any time, if he is in his seat, I object to the request.

Mr. SULZER. I only ask it in order to give every member an opportunity to familiarize himself with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, one moment; has my time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. SULZER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I desire to state briefly that this amendment brings before the House, as clearly and as positively as any proposition can, the question of whether the members of this House are in favor of publicity regarding the trusts or not. If we are sincerely in favor of publicity regarding the trusts we can not, it seems to me, object to this amendment. If we want publicity we can not object to the establishment of this bureau of corporations in the department of commerce and labor, for it is something which will create publicity and secure the information the Attorney-General says he wants in order to enforce the antitrust laws.

In my opinion it is the best plan for publicity yet devised, and will secure the information that every citizen wants regarding the conduct and the management of the great trusts of our country, and go far, in my judgment, to prevent the trusts from violating or evading the law now on the statute books against trusts and monopolies. It has been stated by those more competent to judge perhaps than myself that if this amendment were a law no trust in this country, no corporation, no monopoly, would or could violate the law.

Besides, it would secure all the information desired, and if the laws were violated the Attorney-General would have officially the facts to proceed forthwith and punish such violations. It would prevent the excuse now offered by the Department of Justice.

I think this amendment ought to be adopted. It will be if those who oppose trusts and monopolies and want publicity regarding them, so that the truth shall be known, vote for it. So I offered this amendment to find out and have the country know the names of the members who are sincerely in favor of publicity and who are not. Let the record tell. Now is the time to stand by your professions and live up to your promises. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the report of the bill from the committee provides for a bureau of corporations for the very purpose of providing an executive agency on publicity. Probably this side of the House would not always feel disposed to accept

the language arranged by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] in reference to the method of obtaining publicity.

Very likely the other side of the House will accept the leadership of the gentleman from New York on this question. If so, we shall be content, but the committee which reported the bill has been rather inclined to await the report of the gentlemen from the Judiciary Committee, from both sides of the House, who are engaged in endeavoring to find a proper solution of the method of publicity. There is no disposition on the part of the committee which reported the bill, no disposition on the part of this House, to refuse proper legislation to effect publicity, but, with all due respect to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], I trust that we may be forgiven if we do not always adopt his views upon this subject.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. The section to which the gentleman refers as creating this bureau of corporations, I take it, is section 7?

Mr. MANN. Section 7.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I would ask the gentleman's construction as to what powers such a bureau would have. I have read the section hastily and it seemed to me that it did not give the bureau very much, if any, power to get the information.

Mr. SULZER. That is quite true.

Mr. MANN. There is no doubt whatever, Mr. Chairman, that section 7, as it reads in the bill, will not confer upon the bureau of corporations the power to compel the giving of information, and in that respect it might be said to be defective and clearly would be defective if it were not the purpose to follow it up with additional legislation; but we all know that the members of this House and the members of this Congress are proposing to have additional legislation, and if this bill becomes a law and this bureau of corporations is created, undoubtedly there will be conferred either upon the bureau itself or upon the department the necessary powers to carry out the idea for which the bureau is created.

If it is the preference of the House to take the suggestions—admirable in their nature, but more or less crude in the drawing of the language—of the gentleman from New York, very good; but I should prefer that the House should have the information which comes from the distinguished Judiciary Committee of this House, which intends, as I understand, to report some kind of a bill to the House covering ground like this.

Mr. SULZER. Oh, yes; they will doubtless report a bill some time, some how, some way, and too late in the closing days of this session of Congress ever to pass before we adjourn. You may pass some kind of a bill through the House only to die in the Senate. It is the old, old story.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting in this House for three years to see what action would be taken that would amount to anything to clip the wings of the trusts, and it is immaterial to me whom I am following if the road is clear, whether it be the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I am here to help do something to curtail the increasing power of the trusts, and it is immaterial to me who leads in this, to my mind, good work.

Here is an amendment which proposes some practical legislation to make public the acts and doings of the great trusts and combines of this country, and the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. MANN] fails entirely to point out in this amendment anything

which he thinks even is obnoxious, or is not in accordance with his views. He simply wishes to put off the matter to a more convenient time. It is the same old plea. We have been told, from the President of the United States down, that something should be done to make public the conduct of the trusts. Publicity is the great question which the public is demanding to-day of these corporations. Now, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] can not find any fault with this amendment, if he is simply waiting for something better, why not point out what is wrong in this bill, which is specific, directing, and comprehensive? We are confronted with the proposition now whether we shall do something or continue to do nothing, as we have for the last three years. Let us not dodge or evade our responsibility. The country is looking and waiting to see if we will keep our promises and do something to give publicity to the working of the trusts.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will pardon me for saying that while it possibly is negligence on my part, I never have read the proposition of the gentleman from New York. It may be heavenly for aught I know. It may be perfect; but I should prefer to have it presented to the House in such a way that it can be properly considered by the committee.

Mr. THAYER. Unless the gentleman from Illinois is deaf, he must have heard the reading of it, line by line and word by word, with the last ten minutes.

Mr. MANN. Well, I am not as smart as the gentleman from Massachusetts, if he can understand it from hearing it read.

Mr. THAYER. I hope the opportunity will be granted for gentlemen of this House to discuss and analyze this amendment. I think it comes nearer to the bull's-eye than anything that has been presented. I had occasion to vote with the majority of this House for a constitutional amendment in the last Congress which it was never intended should be passed by the coordinate branch at the other end of this building and which I had very grave doubts about our right to pass; but I want to do something while I am a member of this House or help others in doing something that will make public the acts of the trusts, a proposition which all parties agree is needed, and something that will in some measure satisfy the public. This amendment provides for the very thing we have been discussing here for the last four years. The opportunity is now here. Now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation for those who do not believe in permitting these trusts to go on in the way they have been going.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say just a few words more. In discussing this amendment after it was offered the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said it was crude. That is the word I believe he used. Subsequently, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER], the gentleman from Illinois said he never read the amendment, that he had not heard it read, that he knew nothing whatever about it. It seems to me, sir, it comes with very bad grace for the gentleman from Illinois to characterize an amendment as crude that he has never read and never heard read. But it is characteristic of the gentleman, and shows how much reliance should be given his speech.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been pending before his committee ever since the 2d day of last May. And further, sir, he was present in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when a delegation of the distinguished and representative gentlemen with myself went before his committee

and urged a favorable report on my bill, or at least the incorporation of this amendment, being section 5 in my bill, in a bill creating a department of commerce. He heard every word of that discussion. He asked questions of the gentlemen on that occasion. That discussion is printed. Any member can get a copy of it. It is a part of the records of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on this bill.

It is too late for him now to say that he never read, or heard read, the amendment. In my opinion, he knows all about it, or he would not now oppose it so tenaciously. But if he says it is crude, let me say to him that it has been submitted to some of the greatest lawyers in all this land—lawyers not employed by the trusts—and to men who have studied this trust question, not in the interest of the trusts; but in the interests of all the people, and they have all approved it. They say it will absolutely establish publicity, and do it in the only logical and legal way.

Again, sir, this amendment has been favorably passed on by the labor organizations, by the American Anti-Trust League, by leading thinkers and political economists, and by the honest folk of the land who are earnestly and honestly and fearlessly opposed to trusts and monopolies. The independent press of the country ask for publicity. In editorial after editorial they favor this amendment. The President asks for publicity. The Democrats ask for publicity and will vote to a man for this amendment. The people of the land, from one end of it to the other, demand publicity. The Republicans—that is, a few Republicans—say they want publicity; they say it, but they are afraid to vote for publicity. [Applause.]

The Republicans say they are going to give the people publicity as to the trusts some time, some way, somehow; but the days are going on. This Congress will adjourn on the 4th of next March. The time, gentlemen, is short, and I undertake to say that if this amendment is not adopted now, if it is not put in this bill and kept there, that there will be no antitrust legislation, no law for publicity passed during this session of Congress. The President, the Attorney-General, and all of the distinguished Republicans, including my friend from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], will keep on talking against the trusts, but they will do nothing against them.

The people will not and can not be deceived much longer in this matter. The record here to-day on this amendment will tell the tale. It will show whether the Republicans or the Democrats are sincere. It will tell the world who is for and who is against publicity—who are the friends of the trusts and who are the enemies of monopoly. An ounce of performance is worth a ton of promise. If gentlemen on the other side are sincerely in favor of what the people want, if they favor publicity, you will give the people this ounce of performance to-day, and in my judgment it will truly establish publicity and go far to do away with trust evils.

With publicity—like a searchlight, exposing to public view every violation of law—the trusts and monopolies would hesitate a long time ere they violated the law; and if the Attorney-General promptly enforced the law against them, violations of law would soon cease entirely. But the Attorney-General says substantially in his Pittsburg speech that he can not enforce the law against the trusts because he can not get the evidence of violations of law. Make this amendment a law as a part of this bill and the

Attorney-General will have no difficulty in getting the facts—the evidence—to successfully prosecute every trust that is violating the law.

The law now on the statute books against trusts is clear and plain, and the highest court in the land has passed on its validity and sustained the constitutionality of its provisions. The anti-trust act of 1890 declares that every contract or combination in the nature of a trust in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States and Territories or with foreign nations is a conspiracy, illegal and void, and punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Under this antitrust act it seems to me every trust in the United States can be prosecuted for violation of law, the charter annulled, and the men behind it punished for conspiracy. Every trust by its very nature is in restraint of trade and commerce and in violation of this law.

If you will read the antitrust act of 1890 and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the trans-Missouri freight case and the Addyston Pipe Line case, the conclusion will be irresistible to the logical mind that the fault is not so much with the law as it is with the men who are sworn to enforce the law.

In my opinion—and I say so advisedly—the Department of Justice under the present law can institute and successfully maintain actions against every trust doing business in the United States. The law is clear and plain, and the facts are within the knowledge of all.

Now, adopt this amendment offered by me for publicity regarding the trusts and monopolies, make it a part of this bill, so that it will soon be a law, and the Attorney-General will get all the facts he wants, and official facts that will be evidence sufficient to prosecute and sufficient to win every case against every trust violating the law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 63, yeas 88.

Mr. SULZER. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 75, yeas 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to say one thing. All the Republicans voted against this amendment for publicity and all the Democrats voted for it. That tells the story and the whole story. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY QUESTION.

WE MUST NOT SURRENDER AN INCH OF OUR TERRITORY.

S P E E C H

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

January 20, 1903.



WASHINGTON.

1903.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 16842) making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I move to strike out the last word. I want the floor for a few moments. I was very much interested, Mr. Chairman, in listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] a little while ago regarding the Alaskan boundary. The gentleman from Missouri substantially charged that the Administration was surrendering, or intended to surrender, American territory in Alaska to the Canadian government. He submitted facts to prove this that seem to me to be conclusive; but it needed no proof from him and no eloquent words to demonstrate that to me.

I have been to Alaska several times. I have been over this boundary line. I have talked to people there who know, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that since gold was discovered in the Klondyke the Northwest Mounted Police, acting, we must assume, for the Canadian government, have moved the boundary monuments that the Russians set up years ago, marking the boundary line of the territory that Russia ceded to the United States under the treaty, miles and miles nearer the Pacific Ocean and more and more on American territory. If anyone here doubts it, let me say that there are several people in Washington at this time from Alaska who can give unimpeachable testimony to the fact.

There is no doubt the original boundary line between Canada and southeastern Alaska has been changed by the Canadians during the past few years. What does the gentleman from Iowa say in regard to the allegations made by the gentleman from Missouri? He says, as I understand it, that some time ago, some way, somehow, away back in 1844, an Administration gave up 54° 40'. That was wrong; but two wrongs do not make a right. That surrender is no reason why we should surrender now. No man in this country has ever deprecated the surrender of "fifty-four forty or fight" more than myself. We should have stood by the verdict of the people then. I have traveled some in the great Northwest. I know to some degree what we lost there.

It is one of the grandest countries in all the world—rich beyond the dreams of avarice—a country that can support a population of 50,000,000 people; a country rich in agricultural resources, rich in timber and rich in untold mineral wealth. I am sorry shortsighted statesmanship lost it to us years ago. It was a crime against us and against generations yet unborn. But those in authority did

not know then what we know now. One of the greatest Secretaries of State we ever had—a myriad-minded man, a patriot—Daniel Webster, made the surrender of all the territory from the forty-ninth parallel to the fifty-fourth parallel of latitude westward from the Lake of the Woods because he did not know. He knew all about Massachusetts, but very little about the great Northwest, and when I say that I mean the great Northwest of Canada; but because he then surrendered this territory to Great Britain, because he thought it more or less valueless, that is no reason why the present Secretary of State should surrender an inch of Alaskan territory to Great Britain now. We must maintain our rights in Alaska. We must not give up or let go a rod of American soil there.

Let me say that one of the schemes involved in this alleged boundary dispute is simply this: The Canadian government—and by that I mean, of course, Great Britain—has no port of entry on the Pacific Ocean to the Klondike and to the great Yukon territory. The Canadians want a port of entry on the Lynn Canal, near Skagway or near Dyea, so they can take their goods, wares, and merchandise through without duty. That is what they want. And to accomplish it they have moved the boundary line at Telegraph Creek on the Stickine River several miles westward on American territory, and they have moved the boundary line at Skagway and at Dyea several miles westward on American territory. There is no doubt about this. Witnesses living can testify to it. The Canadian maps will show it. Everybody in Alaska knows it. The boundary line must be put back where it belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my time be extended. I desire to make this matter plain to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULZER. I thank the House. Now, sir, if it had not been for patriotic American citizens at Skagway a few years ago the Northwest Mounted Police, acting under instructions, no doubt, from the Canadian government, would have taken Skagway and raised the British flag over our custom-house there. They moved their line within a few miles of Skagway, destroyed the Russian monuments, and raised the British flag. Then it was that our loyal American citizens in Skagway, at Dyea, and in Sitka began to arm, and notified the Northwest Mounted Police that if they moved one foot farther on American soil there would be war in the great Northwest, and such a war as brave American citizens would fight who know their rights and dare maintain them.

The Northwest Mounted Police stopped, and fortunately for them they did, and the customs flag of the Canadian government has remained there, but it must go back to the original line. The feeling at that time in Alaska was so intense regarding this matter that the Secretary of State and the ambassador of the United States to Great Britain entered into an agreement with the British foreign office, or, more particularly speaking, into what is known as the "modus vivendi." The Secretary of State agreed to that, and from that day to this, under the modus vivendi, every-

thing is supposed to be in statu quo—supposed to be suspended—suspended like Mahomet's coffin, somewhere between heaven and earth. Where it is and what it is nobody who is somebody seems to know, but it appears to be enough to put us all to sleep. We must not sleep, however. If the Americans are not alert, if they are not vigilant, if we do not maintain our rights, I say it is only a question of time when the Canadian government will creep on a little more and more until it will get a port of entry on the Lynn Canal.

The Canadian government is willing, and nobody knows it better than the gentlemen on the Joint High Commission between the United States and Canada, to concede to the United States practically everything in dispute regarding our fisheries, commercial matters, and all other things in dispute, provided the Government of the United States will give the Canadian government a port of entry in Alaska. They are willing to take Dyea, an abandoned town on the Lynn Canal, where all the houses stand empty to-day, mute witnesses of its desertion, as a port of entry—anything in fact so long as they can get a port on the Pacific in Alaska. When the Yukon and White Pass Railroad was built, Skagway became the western terminal and the port of entry to the Yukon, and Dyea, just across the canal, was abandoned and deserted.

The Canadian scheme of pushing through United States territory to an outlet on the Pacific Ocean may lead some day to serious results. "Fifty-four forty or fight" is not yet dead. It may be the shibboleth of another great political campaign, and no back down.

The Alaskan boundary question is brought up again and again by reports that Canadian officers have removed established monuments. There should be no Alaskan boundary question at all. The boundary line was settled absolutely in the treaties between Great Britain and Russia, and Russia and the United States; and it was not disputed for nearly seventy-five years. We bought certain territory which it was conceded that Russia owned and we paid for it; and no United States official should ever have dared to treat the matter as open to doubt or discussion.

The claim set up by Canada, through Great Britain, is a bare-faced fraud; the controversy on the matter was a piece of unspeakable folly on our part; and the adoption of the *modus vivendi* was the first step in some mysterious scheme which may mean the loss of a strip of our Pacific coast line. Great Britain never had any title to the Pacific coast, but she succeeded in bullying us out of that part of it known as British Columbia. I say again we should have stood by the declaration, "Fifty-four forty or fight;" but we lacked the foresight. Seward did something, all that was possible, to retrieve that weakness when he bought the whole Pacific coast northward, and day by day our diplomatists have been preparing the way for another surrender of our plain rights. President Roosevelt, we are told, means to look into this matter himself and act.

Let us hope so. Unless all estimates of his character are astray his course will be to say politely that there is no Alaska boundary question; that it was settled by treaties long ago; and that there is nothing to do but lay down the line described in the treaties.

Thomas W. Balch, in the *Journal of the Franklin Institute for March*, has made an exhaustive historical study of the Alaskan boundary, and has shown that the recent Canadian claim is en-

tirely manufactured and without the support of any treaty or any map, except those made recently in Canada as a basis for a claim to an outlet to the sea through United States territory, and for a demand for arbitration. On this demand Mr. Balch says:

"There is no more reason for the United States to allow its right to the possession of this unbroken Alaskan territory to be referred to the decision of foreign judges than would be the case if the British Empire advanced a claim to sovereignty over the coast of Georgia, or the port of Baltimore, and proposed that this demand should be referred to the judgment of subjects of third powers.

"Whether the Alaskan frontier should pass over a certain mountain top or through a given gorge is a proper subject for settlement by a mutual survey. But by no possibility has Canada any right to territory touching tide water above 54 degrees and 40 minutes. The United States should never consent to refer such a proposition to arbitration."

And I say we never shall while we have an American in the White House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those familiar with this subject are aware that the Canadians are willing to take Dyea as a port of entry on the Alaskan Pacific and, in substance, give us everything in dispute between the two countries. But the American people will never consent to it. The sooner Canada understands this the better. The only question in dispute to-day, I believe, that the Canadian Commissioners and the United States Commissioners can not agree on is this Alaskan boundary question. And on that we stand on our rights. We will not arbitrate, and will never back down.

The Lynn Canal is a great body of water—a magnificent arm of the Pacific Ocean—almost as large, and for strategical and commercial purposes, as important as Long Island Sound. If the Canadians could once get a port of entry there, they could take in all their goods and merchandise into the vast Yukon territory without let or hindrance. They could fortify it and bid us defiance at some critical time when we least expected it. They would then have a port on the Pacific Ocean in the great Northwest, a port that would bring them hundreds and hundreds of miles nearer the Orient than they are to-day. That is what they want, that is what they are after, and that is about the whole question involved in this boundary dispute.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SULZER. Certainly. I always yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is it not entirely practicable now for a Canadian importer to take his merchandise through any port of the United States, in bond, to any port in Canada?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; to a certain extent.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then they can avoid paying duty now.

Mr. SULZER. They can and they do, and that is another thing that ought not to be permitted in Alaska. That is another thing that the Alaskans are kicking about, and if you will talk to some of the Alaskans who are here in Washington—

Mr. HEPBURN. Do they not do it in Portland, do they not do it in New York, your own city, and are the New Yorkers kicking as you say the Alaskans are?

Mr. SULZER. Let me tell you that every American citizen in

the Klondike who comes out with gold dust he has worked hard to get must pay to the Canadians a duty on it and he has got to pay a tax besides. If you went up there you would soon find out these things. The Alaskans believe in fair play. They believe that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. They believe that if the Canadians get all these rights from the United States, the citizens of the United States in the Yukon territory ought to get some rights from the Canadians. I have looked into this matter carefully and knowing the facts as I do, I say here and now that I am opposed to a surrender of 1 inch of American territory in Alaska. I want to see the Secretary of State dissolve the *modus vivendi* and the Administration speedily compel Great Britain to recognize the title and the boundary in Alaska as it came to us from Russia. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

* * * * *

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the concluding statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER]. I am glad to find that there is at least one Democrat, a very eminent Democrat, one who speaks, I think, by authority, who certainly ought to be permitted to speak by authority, saying that he is opposed to pulling down the American flag from an inch of our territory. I am glad to know that the Democratic party is changing its attitude with regard to the Philippine Islands. I am glad to know that he approves now of the course of the Administration. I am glad that he gives his adhesion, late as it is, to the policy of holding on, of civilizing, of doing something for those people in the great uplift of mankind. I am glad he is on that tenable ground. But I was sorry to hear the disparaging remarks that he made about Daniel Webster.

I knew that he would not make similar disparaging remarks about Henry Clay, because everybody recognizes the great resemblance between the gentleman from New York and the distinguished savant from Kentucky. [Laughter and applause.] But I confess I do not know exactly what he means when he speaks of Daniel Webster in the belittling way that he does, when he says that Daniel Webster did not know much out of the State of Massachusetts. I do not know whether he meant to say that Daniel Webster knew nothing or but little except those things that were intimately connected with Massachusetts, or whether he meant to say that when Daniel Webster passed the boundary line of Massachusetts his great intellect at once shrunk, and that vast reservoir of information that he had been filling for so many years became of inconsiderable value.

I wish the gentleman would be a little more explicit when he has five minutes in his own time to discuss this—to discuss this subject, and tell us just how he does regard Daniel Webster, and just how his opinion as to Daniel Webster is to be affected; whether it is territorially or personally; whether it inheres in Daniel himself or in Daniel's travels. The American people would be glad to hear the gentleman re-form this opinion that he has expressed, so that they would know exactly what he did mean. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. I move to strike out the last two words.

* * * * *

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire, briefly, to reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. In the first place, I want

to say that I made no reflection on the great ability and intellectuality of Daniel Webster. No man in this country respects his great name more than I do. But what I did say, and what I meant to say, and what I want everybody to distinctly understand I did say, was this: That Daniel Webster knew nothing about the vast domain in the great Northwest. Neither did others of his day, and even later—much later. Read Benjamin F. Butler's speech against the purchase of Alaska when the bill was passing this House for its purchase for \$7,200,000. Benjamin F. Butler voted against the bill, denounced it, and said, "We were buying an iceberg," whereas the climate of southeastern Alaska is milder and more genial than the climate of Washington.

At Sitka, supposed by some to be a frozen iceberg, the records kept by the Russians and Americans down to the present day show that the thermometer never reaches zero; and farther south in the great archipelago the climate in winter is much warmer, and delightfully cool and invigorating in summer. Alaska is a great land, a vast empire, and no one can tell to-day how rich it is in mineral, timber, and agricultural wealth. We are only on the threshold of knowledge concerning it, and I reiterate that we ought to be very careful about surrendering any part of it. Now is the time to be careful. It is better to be sure than be sorry. The experience of the past should be the light to guide us now and in the future. I want to see the American people hold fast to every inch of Alaskan domain, just as it came to us from Russia.

Now, one other thing, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Iowa has said that he is glad to know I am opposed to pulling down the flag. It is kind of him to say that. I am opposed to hauling down the flag when the flag is right. I have never advocated hauling down the flag on American territory, and I never will. [Applause.] I favored taking down the flag in Cuba, because we were pledged to do it, because we said to all the world that just so soon as we established peace and a stable government in Cuba we would get out and leave Cuba to the Cubans. I was in favor of keeping our word. I was in favor of taking down the flag in the Philippines and bringing it home with honor, because I sincerely and patriotically believed to keep it there with shot and shell and force would dishonor it and all that it stands for.

I was in favor then, and am now, of treating the Filipinos just the same as we treated the Cubans, and some day history will say I was right. I still believe in the principles of the Declaration of Independence. I still love the memories of our better days, and I believe the Filipinos are just as capable of self-government as the Cubans. Be that, however, as it may, I will not discuss it further now. I have not the time. I am talking about Alaska, and I will not be diverted by the gentleman from Iowa.

There is no question, I maintain, about our title to Alaska or about the loyalty and the patriotism of the Americans there. There is no question either, in my judgment, about the boundary, the original boundary which was agreed to by England and Russia almost a century ago, and which never was disputed in any way by anybody or any country until gold was discovered in the Klondyke.

I tell you, and you know it, and the history of the world proves it, that wherever gold is found England is always on hand trying to secure all or some of the territory. In Alaska the land in dispute in the boundary question is rich in gold and other precious

metals, and England is trying to get all of it she can. If we are foolish enough to let her do it, we should not unjustly blame England; we should blame ourselves. I want to call a halt now and insist once and for all on our rights in Alaska. Is that too much? Should I be blamed for that? Let my friend answer. While we supinely sleep under the narcotic influence of Mr. Choate's *modus vivendi*, Canada is awake and creeps on apace, and in time it will be too late. This is a live, a momentous question, and we should be up and doing, not wait, not delay.

The Secretary of State must stand by our rights in Alaska. The *modus vivendi* must end, and the land we got from Russia, and the boundary marks she put there must forever be our land, and the Russian monuments on the mountain ranges 10 marine leagues from the mainland must be as it used to be—the true boundary line. Alaska belongs to us; we bought it; our people are there; they want to stay there; our flag is there; it must stay there, and we must stand by the patriots, those noble, brave, and gallant men who went there from our States. That is what we should do; that is the way I feel on this subject.

If we do not do it—if we sacrifice an inch of our domain in Alaska, the Alaskans will denounce us now, and future generations will execrate our memory as we to-day criticise, to use no stronger term, the men who surrendered the great Northwest after the people had determined by an election that it must be ours, that it must be 54° 40' or fight. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

A L A S K A .

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, January 22, 1903.

WASHINGTON.
1903.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 9865) providing for the election of a Delegate from the Territory of Alaska to the House of Representatives of the United States, defining citizenship, and the qualifications of electors in said Territory—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I substantially concur with all that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] has so well, and so ably, and so eloquently said regarding Alaska, and the needs of that vast domain for immediate legislation, looking toward home rule and self-government.

The bill now under consideration for a Delegate, however, in my opinion, does not go far enough. It will not meet the just demands of the people of Alaska, and I fear very much that it will not give satisfaction to, or meet the expectations of, the inhabitants of that vast territory. At the same time I do not fail to realize that this bill is a step in the right direction, that it will accomplish something, and I shall vote for it for that reason, indulging the hope that the time is not far distant when the Congress must give Alaska what Alaska wants—Territorial government. That is, sir, what the people up there want, and that is what they ought to have. It is right, and it is American. Alaska is just as much entitled to Territorial government to-day as Arizona or New Mexico. If we follow the precedents of the past we can not withhold this boon from the people of Alaska. They are fairly entitled to it.

In the light of all precedents and the experience of the past their population warrants it. For the benefit of those who know not, I insert a table which shows the population of 12 different States and Territories about the time they were given representation. Many of them had a representative for some time before the enumeration had been made which brought forth these figures. Probably at the time of their receiving Delegate privileges this population did not average 3,000 whites in each Territory, and they had very little but agricultural matters to look after, with no comparison in commercial affairs to Alaska to-day.

	Date of organization.	Population by census nearest date of organization.		
		Census.	White.	Total.
Arizona.....	Feb. 24, 1863	1870	9,581	9,658
Dakota—North and South.....	Mar. 2, 1861	1860	2,576	4,837
Idaho.....	Mar. 3, 1863	1870	10,618	14,999
Illinois.....	Feb. 3, 1809	1810	11,501	12,282
Indiana.....	May 7, 1800	1800	2,402	2,517
Michigan.....	Jan. 11, 1805	1810	4,618	4,762
Minnesota.....	Mar. 2, 1849	1850	6,938	6,977

	Date of organization.	Population by census nearest date of organization.		
		Census.	White.	Total.
Mississippi.....	Apr. 7, 1798	1800	4,446	7,600
Montana.....	May 26, 1864	1870	18,306	20,595
Nevada.....	Mar. 2, 1866	1860	6,812	6,857
Utah.....	Sept. 9, 1850	1850	11,830	11,380
Washington.....	Mar. 2, 1853	1860	11,138	11,594
Wyoming.....	July 28, 1866	1870	8,726	9,118
Alaska.....		1890	4,298	32,052
		1898	10,000	37,000

In 1890 the census of Alaska showed a population of 32,052. The census report for 1900 gives the population of Alaska as 63,592. When we consider the vast difficulty attendant upon the full and correct enumeration of population in thickly settled and more accessible districts, and how frequently the statement is made even in large cities that the census enumerators failed to properly enumerate and return a considerable per cent of the population, then how much more likely is it that in a district like Alaska, a vast expanse of territory with widely scattered towns, settlements, and mining camps, isolated and separated, without railroad and telegraphic communications—how much more likely is it, I say, that where conditions like these exist that the census enumeration has not been full and complete.

I submit, in view of the foregoing, that it is not an extravagant estimate to place the present population of the Territory of Alaska at 100,000 people, and this population will undoubtedly increase in a greater ratio during the next few years than it has in the past.

The number of white people were less than 5,000 in 1890, with a very large portion of the remainder Indians and mixed. This great increase during the last ten years has not been caused by the births of natives. The Indian is rapidly passing away, so that the majority of the present population of 63,592 are beyond question whites who have emigrated from the States. These persons dominate the Territory, and in a short time, through the evolution of nature, the native Indian will have become a tradition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, by way of comparison, let me cite you a few cases. In the record of Territorial organizations we find that Nebraska, embracing all the district of country lying between the Missouri River and the Rocky Mountains and extending from the 40th degree of latitude to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, was made a Territory in 1854, with a population too insignificant to be mentioned in the report of the preceding census, if, indeed, it were ascertainable. Yet we find that six years later it had attained a population of only 28,841—less than half that of Alaska in 1900. The Territory of Dakota, embracing what are now the States of North and South Dakota, was organized in 1861, having for two years previous maintained a provisional government of her own, although she was credited by the census of 1860 with a population of only 4,837, which, owing to the unsettled state of the country induced by the great civil war during that decade, increased to the extent of only 9,544 in the next succeeding ten years.

The capital was established at Yankton, in the extreme south-eastern end of what is now the State of South Dakota, distant from the most remote settlements little, if any, less than 700 miles. There were no railroads or wagon roads, and the means of communication, except between Missouri River points, were not only more primitive than is now the case in Alaska, but at the same time far more expensive and dangerous. The country was a vast wilderness of treeless prairie, arid plains, and "bad lands," which, but for the building of subsidized railroads in advance of settlement, would never have become the home of any considerable number of white men. It was not then known to possess any of the great natural resources of which Alaska can now truthfully boast, and had the little handful of hardy pioneers who set up a government of their own in advance of Territorial organization been subjected to the operation of a policy similar to that which long ago obtained in the government of Alaska, and is still in vogue, it is not improbable that what are now two great and prosperous States of the Union would have remained to this day, figuratively speaking, a wilderness.

And so, sir, with many, if not all, of the Territories when they were first organized. The facts and the figures conclusively prove that Alaska is more entitled now to Territorial government than any of the Territories organized in the years gone by west of the Mississippi River. Why should we deprive the citizens of Alaska of Territorial government? Is there a man here that can give any answer, except the logical answer that Alaska should become a Territory with all the rights of a Territory?

Mr. Chairman, the district of Alaska is a vast domain lying in the extreme northwestern corner of the North American continent, on Bering Sea and the North Pacific. It comprises an area of about 577,390 statute square miles, with a seacoast of 26,000 miles, or nearly two and one-half times the seacoast of the balance of the United States. The district was acquired by purchase by the United States from Russia for \$7,200,000, and the boundaries as laid down in the treaty of cession of March 30, 1867, are: "Commencing from the southernmost point of the island called 'Prince of Wales Island,' which point lies in the parallel of 54° 40' north latitude, and between the one hundred and thirty-first and one hundred and thirty-third degrees of west longitude (meridian of Greenwich), the said line shall ascend to the north along the channel called Portland Canal as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude; from this last-mentioned point the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude (of the same meridian), and finally from the said point of intersection the said meridian line of the one hundred and forty-first degree in its prolongation as far as the frozen ocean. With reference to the line of demarcation laid down in the preceding article it is understood, first, that the island called 'Prince of Wales Island' shall belong wholly to Russia (now, by cession, to the United States); second, that whenever the summit of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast from the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude shall prove to be at the distance of more than 10 marine leagues from

the ocean, the limit between the British possessions and the line of coast which is to belong to Russia as above mentioned (that is to say, the limit of the possessions ceded by this convention) shall be formed by a line parallel to the winding of the coast, and which shall never exceed the distance of 10 marine leagues therefrom. The western limits, within which the territories and dominion conveyed are contained, passes through a point in Bering Straits on the parallel of 65 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, and its intersection by the meridian which passes midway between the island of Krusenstern, or Ignalook, and the island of Ratmanoff, or Noonarbook, and proceeds due north, without limitation, into the same frozen ocean. The same western limitation, beginning at the same initial point, proceeds thence in a course nearly south-west through Bering Straits and Bering Sea, so as to pass midway between the northwest point of the island of St. Lawrence and the southeast point of Cape Choukotski, to the meridian of 172 west longitude; thence from the intersection of that meridian, in a southwesterly direction, so as to pass midway between the island of Attou and the Copper Island of the Kormandorski couplet or group in the North Pacific Ocean, to the meridian of 193 degrees west longitude, so as to include in the territory conveyed the whole of the Aleutian Islands east of the meridian."

This is the vast domain of land ceded to the United States from Russia by the treaty in 1867, and the American people will never consent to give up an inch of it to Canada or any other country. It is ours and it must always be ours. We can not arbitrate our sovereignty, and we will never surrender our jurisdiction.

When this country in 1867 paid Russia \$7,200,000 in gold coin for the Territory of Alaska, a great outcry arose over the shameful extravagance of the Government. We had purchased, it was alleged by these fault-finders, a barren waste of snow and ice, an arctic region incapable of cultivation, whose only treasure was the seals that might be killed along its coast. The Administration had squandered the money of the people, and shrewd Russia was laughing in her sleeve over our simplicity!

It is possible that Russia did laugh in her sleeve over the simplicity that she imagined she had discovered, but it is certain that by this time she has changed her laugh to a sigh over the results of her own shortsightedness, for Alaska is recognized today as one of the most important gold-producing lands in the world. Her mines are the mecca of armies of prospectors, who go there to search for the precious ore that is the foundation of the money systems of the commercial world. She has returned to us in gold ore alone more than we paid Russia for her possession, and the sources of her golden treasure have as yet scarcely been scratched.

But it is not only in mineral wealth that Alaska promises to be a valuable territory. That claim alone would be ample justification for the purchase of the arctic land, but she has other claims to add to this. Had anybody predicted, when the negotiation for her sale was conducted, that she could ever assume to be an agricultural country, he would have been regarded as a fit subject for treatment in a lunatic asylum. But we are progressing in knowledge. The Agricultural Department has been investigating, and it now announces that certain crops can be raised in Alaska at a good profit, and that great herds of cattle will thrive in her friendly climate.

Thus the purchase of Alaska promises to be one of the wisest things ever accomplished by our Government.

The great speech of Charles Sumner, delivered in the United States Senate in favor of the purchase of Alaska, in the light of to-day reads like a marvelous prophecy. Alaska ceased years ago to be called "Seward's folly." No amount of money could buy it from us to-day, and ultimately it will make three great States of the Union—and no doubt they will be called "Alaska," "Seward," and "Sumner." What a monument Alaska is to-day to the wisdom and far-sighted statesmanship of Charles Sumner and William H. Seward!

Mr. Chairman, another reason for a Delegate, which must impress itself with great force upon every member, is the fact that most of the relations with the Territory are direct with the General Government.

The Committee on the Territories, to whom was referred this bill providing for the election of a Delegate from the district of Alaska to the House of Representatives of the United States, defining citizenship and the qualifications of electors in said district, have had the same under consideration, and, without a dissenting voice, report unanimously that it do pass.

A bill of similar purpose was reported from the Committee on the Territories of the House of Representatives in the Fifty-third Congress near its close, too late for action, and another in the Fifty-fourth Congress, which for some reason failed to become a law. A third time, in the second session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, a similar bill was introduced and unanimously reported by the Committee on the Territories to the House, but the bill, on account of the press of business during the close of that session, failed of consideration in the House.

In my opinion, fortified by the judgment of the great majority of the population of the Territory of Alaska, whose best men have not only recommended it, but have urged it as an absolute necessity at this time, I submit that the Congress should no longer delay the right of these people to Delegate representation.

It is a tenet of our American creed that proper elective representation is the heritage of our citizenship. Whatever may have been the needs and the requirements of the limitations of Alaska in the past, I think the time has now arrived when it is not only feasible for its inhabitants to elect and have Delegate representation in the House of Representatives, but that its absolute necessity makes it a matter of right which we should heed by speedy action.

Alaska is a Territory whose prospects, resources, and commercial and political importance have heretofore been almost wholly unappreciated by most people. Even now, in the period of Alaska's marvelous development, the first thought of many persons is that a Delegate would be a doubtful experiment and an unnecessary expense, when, in fact, of all our outlying Territories, Alaska is the one whose needs in this respect are paramount. Its isolation, distance, and peculiar surroundings as to climate, soil, resources, business and trade conditions, as well as population, render it impossible for Congress to fully recognize its wants and exigencies.

Alaska has an area of over 577,000 square miles. It would cover one-sixth of the territory of the United States proper. Its resources are simply wonderful; with its mines of gold, silver,

copper, and coal, its mighty forests of merchantable timber, its rich wealth of fur-bearing animals, its enormous fisheries of seal, whale, salmon, cod, and halibut, and its already great and commanding commercial and political importance. And then, in connection with all this, comes the voice of a resistless and increasing flow of the most manly, virile, and hardy people in the world, who say, "Give us the protection of an interested and sympathetic Government and we will not only support ourselves, but we will return direct into the United States Treasury revenues many times multiplying the amount of her investment by purchase."

At this point the expense of an election and the salary of a Delegate might well be considered. This country is a large territory of the primeval ruggedness of nature, unmitigated in part with long stretches of snow and ice and a scattered population. There may be inconveniences in an election on the frontier to which we are not accustomed, but that is the daily incident of their lives. Tenacity of purpose and power of endurance are the two essential qualities that took them there. They have great interests to be looked after, and they say, "We want a man at Washington who knows us, our country, and our business to represent us and our interests."

It will be of some inconvenience and expense, but they are asking the privilege to incur whatever inconvenience it may be to hold an election. After that the only question for us to consider is: Is it reasonable and practicable? Those who seem to be most competent to judge say it is. As to the expense, they pay it. That is all there is to that. While discussing this phase of the subject I desire to insert a statement from the Treasury Department showing the revenues and expenditures of the government of Alaska for the fiscal year 1900. This shows a balance in favor of the Treasury in the splendid figures of \$282,950, out of which to pay the expense of an election every two years.

Statement of revenues and expenditures in Alaska, fiscal year 1900.

REVENUES.	
Customs.....	\$57,623.62
Public lands.....	2,376.32
Tax on seal skins.....	224,476.47
Rent of Fox Islands.....	1,200.00
License fees.....	157,234.64
Total.....	442,911.85
EXPENDITURES.	
Expenses of Territorial government.....	\$28,655.98
Salaries of agents at seal fisheries.....	11,473.41
Expenses, office of marshal, etc.....	17,969.90
Public buildings.....	475.39
Refuge station, Point Barrow.....	106.67
Alaskan boundary survey.....	500.00
Education of children.....	\$32,970.62
Education of Indians.....	4,364.30
Protecting fisheries.....	5,512.47
Expenses of steamer <i>Albatross</i>	9,630.93
Supplies for native inhabitants.....	19,100.58
Building for United States courts.....	722.76
Reindeer for Alaska.....	12,746.68
Expenses, office of surveyor-general.....	4,300.00
Maps of Alaska.....	18.50
Survey of the Yukon River.....	9,780.69
Relief of people in mining regions.....	932.48
Total.....	159,961.16

But, aside from the question of expense, why should they not have a Delegate at this time? In the first place there is a large and ever-increasing body of the best kind of American citizens in Alaska—pioneers who are willing to forego the ease and luxury of life in the States to develop that great country. The best blood of a nation flows in the veins of its pioneers. They are the advance guard of progress. They have opened up in Alaska a mine of wealth that the world never dreamed of. They have made Alaska commercially great, and for a decade have felt the need and practicability of a Delegate, and have been asking it from our hands for years. To-day, with a population doubled since the last census was taken and material financial interests increased in a still greater ratio, they ask you for this legislation.

The bill under consideration gives the people of Alaska the right to vote for and to elect a Delegate from Alaska to the House of Representatives who shall have the same rights and the same privileges in this body as a Delegate from any of the other Territories in the United States. Alaska is entitled to that. No one can deny it. Her people should be heard on this floor, and the Alaskans want to be heard here by some one of their own selection—competent to speak for them. Some one vested with authority who will be responsible to them for what he says on the floor of this House regarding Alaskan matters, and who will be responsible to Congress as well. No one familiar with the facts can doubt that Alaska is entitled to Delegate representation. It is a fundamental principle of our theory of government that none of our citizens shall be taxed without just representation, and the Alaskans have been taxed by the Federal Government for years and years without representation and without having a voice in their own internal affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to Alaska several times. I know something about that vast domain. I know something about the sentiments of the people who live there, and I stand here and declare with the confident knowledge that I can not be successfully contradicted that the people of Alaska—the people who have gone there, and who have lived there for years, and who are bona fide residents of Alaska, and intend to stay there during the rest of their lives—I know what they want, and I declare here that they want not only a representative in Congress, but they want Territorial government. They want the right that every other Territory in the Union has—the right to make their own laws, to levy their own taxes, to regulate their own internal affairs, and to spend the money gathered by the tax collector for their own use, for their own schools, for their own charitable institutions, for their own municipal affairs, and for their own peace and happiness. This is not asking too much in my opinion. It seems to me it is only fair and just and proper and right. Alaska has a population at the present time upward of 100,000 bona fide residents. It is true they are scattered over a vast domain of territory. But it is also true that they are an honest, brave, sober, manly, God-fearing people, who are of our kin, and who ought to be treated as American citizens.

I deprecate some of the remarks that have been made on the floor of this House during the pendency of this bill by gentlemen who have characterized the inhabitants of Alaska as nomads, as fugitives, and as a migratory people who go there simply to gather

wealth and leave for the States just so soon as they have been able to get what they want. I deny these statements. I refute these allegations. I know they are not true. If some of the gentlemen who have made these unjust remarks and uncalled-for statements would only go to Alaska and see for themselves and talk to these people, they would come back here just as firmly convinced as I am that no people in all our land are more deserving of commendation for their patriotism and their law-abiding citizenship than the good, fearless, honest folk of Alaska. They are American citizens. They demand the rights of American citizens. They are entitled to all the rights of American citizens, and one of the fundamental rights of an American is the right to representation; the right to refuse to pay a dollar's tax to the Government unless he has a voice in its affairs; the right of local self-government; the right of petition; the right of assembly; the right to have a voice in the affairs of state and in making the laws that he must obey and that govern him and his fellow-citizens.

This bill, sir, will not accomplish what the Alaskans demand; but, as I said, it is a step in the right direction, and I shall vote for it because I believe it is the best we can get at the present time. I hope, however, when this bill passes the House and comes before the Senate, that the other branch of Congress will enlarge the scope of its provisions and, if possible, report a substitute for it that will give the people of Alaska what they most devoutly desire, and that is Territorial government. They demand Territorial government, and knowing the facts as I do, I unhesitatingly say, and I defy successful refutation, that under all the circumstances Alaska is now, and long has been, entitled to Territorial government, and Congress ought to give it to the Alaskans without any more delay. Alaska is an anomaly in our sisterhood of States and Territories. It has been said here that Alaska is a Territory because a justice of the United States Supreme Court, writing an opinion about it, characterized it as such. No doubt it is a part of the territory of the United States, and perhaps that is what the distinguished jurist meant. Others here declare that Alaska is only a district, and I am inclined to concur in that view. If Alaska was a Territory in the Union, it would have all the rights of a Territory. It is not a Territory in the sense that Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma are Territories. It ought to be a Territory of our Government just the same as those other Territories and have all the rights and all the privileges that those Territories possess to-day; and the Alaskans will never be satisfied—never be contented—in my opinion, with any law that does not give them all the rights those other Territories possess.

A Delegate from an unorganized Territory would be not only a departure from all former precedent, but in the case of Alaska might be much more productive of evil than of beneficial results. In the absence of any form of local government, it may be impossible for a Delegate to properly represent the will and the wishes of the people, because of a lack of knowledge in the premises. I know that the people of Alaska are, in every point of view, abundantly capable of maintaining a local form of government, such as has always heretofore been accorded the Territories of the United States, and I deprecate the idea of further burdening the Congress with purely local legislation; as would, presumably, be the duty of a Delegate to press upon the attention

of this body in the absence of Territorial organization. In my opinion, such legislation can safely be intrusted to the people of Alaska themselves, and in my judgment, instead of the bill providing a Delegate for the unorganized Territory, or district, of Alaska, an organic act should be passed, according to her people the measure of self-government to which they are justly entitled, and which has never heretofore, except in the case of Alaska, been withheld from any considerable body of American citizens engaged in the settlement of a new district.

Looking at the question in the light of the past, and by way of comparison with other portions of our country that have been made Territories in our Union, I believe that Alaska is more entitled to-day to Territorial government than seven-tenths of the other Territories that were organized. I am opposed, as a matter of right, and of justice, and of principle, to taxing the Alaskan people, gathering the taxes by a Federal tax collector, and, instead of giving the taxes to the people of Alaska for their own local purposes, depositing the money in the Federal Treasury and trying to govern Alaska from the Treasury Department or by the Congress, when nine-tenths of the men in Congress know absolutely nothing about the people up there, nor the country, either. But that is another story that will come up ere long, when we legislate to give Alaska Territorial government.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said here regarding the impossibility of holding an election in Alaska under this bill, should it become a law, and that its provisions would open the door to frauds on the ballot box. In my opinion, that conclusion is assumed, farfetched, and without justification. If this bill should become a law in its present state, the election of a Delegate in Congress from Alaska would be just as honestly conducted as the election for a Representative in Congress in any State. And the Delegate elected would be, no doubt, in the estimation of the Alaskans, or in the estimation of a majority of them, the most competent man they could find to send here to represent them, to get their rights, and to give Congress the information desired regarding legislation.

Let me say here, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate all that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] has done in getting this bill reported and before the House. I understand the difficulties he had to contend with. I am familiar with the obstacles which were put in his way. I know he has done the very best he could. He and I substantially agree regarding the immediate legislative needs of Alaska, but everything relating to Alaska can not be accomplished in one Congress. This bill is a step in the right direction—a forward step toward Territorial government—and it is apparently the very best that we can do for the Alaskans at the present time. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Washington and the members of the committee which reported this bill on the success which thus far has crowned their efforts, and in the hope that this bill will accomplish some good I shall vote for it, and I trust it will pass by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken of Alaskan resources in general terms as a reason for her recognition. Her mines of gold, silver, coal, and copper, already known to be great, are considered by many practically inexhaustible. She has the largest stamp mill in the world at Treadwell and bids fair to become the greatest gold-producing country on earth. The rapid development of the

gold and silver mining industry of Alaska during the past four years is shown by the fact that the production has advanced from about \$3,000,000 in 1896 to about \$7,000,000 in 1900. This will increase, rather than diminish. At present the value of the precious metals lies chiefly in the gold placers of Nome and the interior regions. In the Nome region some 5,000 square miles are known to carry auriferous gravels, while in the Yukon Basin the area of auriferous gravels is probably several times as large. But it is not all placer mining. Governor Brady says that quartz mining is the kind in which Alaska will be preeminent in the near future and that even now it is affording the finest illustration that the world knows of profitable working of low-grade ore.

In the coast region of southeastern Alaska mining for gold, copper, and silver has been going on for a number of years. The development of this industry has been especially rapid since 1898, and it promises to become one of the most important mining districts of the country. The discovery of copper deposits in Alaska was made only three years ago, and hence the development is comparatively insignificant, though there are three districts in which valuable copper ores have been found. Mining has only been done in the one lying on the coast, and many tons of copper ore have been shipped from the Territory. The investigations of the past two years have shown, however, that there are unquestionably vast undeveloped copper deposits in at least three districts of Alaska. The coal of Alaska embraces lignites, bituminous coal, and some anthracite. The lignites are the most widely distributed of the three, and are the ones that have been largely prospected. Coal has been found in nearly every part of the District, both on the coast and in the interior. It has been mined at probably 100 different localities, but up to the present time only for local consumption, and the aggregate output, of which there are no authentic data available, would not amount to more than a few thousand tons a year. The coal is so widely distributed in the district that it must be regarded as one of its most important resources. It is a conservative estimate to place the area occupied by the coal-bearing rocks at 100,000 square miles. Accurate statements can not be made as to the figures of the fish industry for the year 1900, but it can be said that it has been continually growing and is still in its infancy. More than one hundred varieties of food fish inhabit the Alaskan waters. The annual output of salmon alone will amount to more than \$9,000,000 at this time. The Territory alone can feed the fish-eating world.

Mr. Chairman, no man can visit Alaska without being deeply impressed. Alaska is a wonderful country. No words can adequately describe it. It is the poor man's, and the rich man's, and the sportsman's paradise. It is a wonderland. The time, in my judgment, is at hand when this vast territory will be developed by American genius, American capital, and American enterprise, and take my word for it, there will be no more prosperous section in all this progressive land for American brawn and American brain. Alaska is the place for the new settler—for the hustler—for the man who wants to go ahead and get on.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, let me say again in conclusion, I shall vote for this bill, but in doing so I think I have made it clear that the bill does not go far enough, that it is only a step forward in the right direction to the one boon the good people in Alaska demand, and that is Territorial government. Alaska wants this; Alaska

must have it; Alaska with her population of nearly 100,000 people; Alaska with her splendid and invigorating climate; Alaska with her beautiful scenery, her magnificent distances, her towering snow-capped mountains, her majestic rivers, her fertile fields, her great industries of fish and furs and timber and agricultural possibilities; Alaska with her immense wealth in gold and copper and silver and lead and iron and coal—mineral wealth beyond the dreams of the most imaginative person in the world; Alaska with her brave and loyal and God-fearing and patriotic American citizens; Alaska with her churches and schools, her splendid institutions, her towns and villages; Alaska under the blue dome of the Union sky and in the shadow of the midnight sun; Alaska with her incomparable glaciers, with her great harbors and innumerable lakes and countless cascades; Alaska, in the name of of all these and more, in the name of this generation and the glory of our institutions, I ask why you should not have the right of home rule, of local self-government, and all the rights of the Territories? [Applause.]

The Trusts—Do the People like to be Humbugged?

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

February 7, 1903.

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This so-called and much-heralded antitrust bill, stripped of all its tautology, pruned of its crudeness, and separated from its extraneous verbiage, seems to an uninitiated and unsophisticated individual like myself to be a very good bill to give the trusts the right to continue business at the old stand and keep on robbing the people all the time without let or hindrance unless, in their magnanimity, they see fit to tell the people the method of their scientific system of taking from the many for the benefit of the few and make such returns to the Government—true or false—regarding their affairs as they desire. It is an antitrust bill only in name. The friends of the trusts can vote for it with as much pleasure as the foes of monopoly. It will do no great good, and it will do no great harm. It may please some, especially those who say there are good and bad trusts and that we must go slow for fear of injuring a good monopoly.

Mr. Chairman, before the last election the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], in all the glory of his greatness, perambulated around the country making speeches and posing as the great and only and original and simon-pure trust buster. He had introduced in this House a bill which to some extent would curb the power and the sway of the trusts, and it was entitled "A bill requiring all corporations engaged in interstate commerce to file returns with the Secretary of the Treasury, disclosing their true financial condition, and of their capital stock, and imposing a tax upon such as have outstanding capital stock unpaid in whole or in part."

That was a good title, and the bill, so far as it went, was a fairly effective measure. Now, sir, I notice that in the bill which the gentleman from Maine has reported from the Committee on the Judiciary as a substitute for his original bill he has struck out that title and practically presents to the House an entirely different bill from the bill which he introduced on December 2, 1901, before the last Congressional election. It is for all remedial purposes a new bill—a bill which, if it were enacted into law, would not do any harm to the trusts, and in my humble opinion would not remedy a single trust evil that the people complain about to-day.

The new title to the new bill is as follows: "A bill requiring corporations engaged in interstate commerce to make returns,

prohibiting rebates and discriminations and the use of interstate commerce in attempts to destroy competition, and for other purposes."

That tells the story. This new bill does not require "all" corporations to make returns; only some; only those to be hereafter organized, and the word "true" is also eliminated, so that the next growth of monopolies can simply make such returns as they see fit—true or false, good, bad, or indifferent. And the new bill, too, if you will compare it with the original, is just as flimsy, just as insincere, and just as hypocritical; but, in my opinion, it goes a great way to change the law now on the statute books known as the antitrust law of 1890 in repealing by implication the civil and criminal penalties provided in that law.

I do not stand alone in this opinion. Several distinguished lawyers who have carefully investigated this proposed bill believe that if it should be enacted into law the Attorney-General of the United States and the United States district attorneys would be absolutely powerless to enforce the civil and criminal penalties under the antitrust act of 1890. If this be so the bill, weak and impotent as it is, may become the agency of nullifying the provisions of the only law we now have to prosecute and punish criminal monopolists and trust conspirators.

The bill is defective, but perhaps it was intended to be so for this very reason, and instead of being against the trusts is intended under the surface to really be for the trusts. This is a very serious matter, and this bill should not pass this House without a proviso that nothing contained in its provisions should be construed as amending or changing any of the provisions of the antitrust law of 1890.

The criminal trusts of the land are more opposed to the penal penalties of the act of 1890 than to any provisions contained in this bill. And in this respect I might say it seems strange that no Attorney-General since 1890 has ever had the temerity to enforce the criminal provisions of the act of 1890 against any violator of the law. Why? You all know the reason why. The trust magnates are too powerful.

And this new bill, so cleverly drawn, so cleverly worded, and so cleverly devised, not so much by the gentleman from Maine as by some distinguished trust lawyers, may have for its sole purpose the elimination of the criminal provisions of the statute of 1890. If that is so—if that is the latent intent of this new bill—then I can understand why the trusts are not opposed to it, and why every friend of the trusts here is in favor of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is too bad that under the rule adopted a member can not amend this new bill, and I regret my friend from Maine did not stick to his original bill; but somehow, Mr. Chairman, these trust lawyers succeeded in changing the opinion of the great "trust buster" from Maine, so that he stands here to-day revealed in his true colors [laughter], not as a great "trust buster," but as a great trust advocate. [Laughter.]

I thought my friend from Maine was a true friend of the people and a real enemy of the criminal trusts; but alas! it seems otherwise. I am sorry for it; I am sorry for him and for myself, because my simple faith has been rudely shaken. [Laughter.] I thought the gentleman was sincere; that he meant all he said on the hustings; that he really was to be the agency through whom the overtaxed, hoodwinked, and oppressed people would secure

their rights against the trusts and monopolies; but I was mistaken. [Laughter.]

I thought the gentleman was honest in all he said against the trusts and that the trust-owned and trust-controlled newspapers meant all they said about his heroic efforts to crush the trusts. I looked up to him; I wanted to follow him wherever he went to grapple with monopolies. I thought he would be bold and audacious as he pursued the octopus, but I am disappointed.

The gentleman does not go far; he does not rage against the iniquity of the monopolies; but, on the contrary, he seems very mild and rather apologetic, and even goes so far as to inform us that there were monopolies before the tariff, and before the Republican party, and before Christ, and before the Flood. It is all no doubt very wonderful—but quite beyond me.

The gentleman's new trust bill, so different from the gentleman's original antitrust bill, his remarkable speech yesterday, and his attitude here to-day have disconcerted his antitrust friends, mystified every foe of monopoly, and put every one of his true followers all at sea. Even his friend, the President, must stand aghast when he contemplates the gentleman's sudden change of front on this important question, and I hardly know what the President will do with this new bill if it ever passes the Senate and goes to the White House. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we should be careful not to nullify any part of the antitrust law of 1890. That is a good law, and if it were enforced it would remedy most of the trust evils. In regard to that law and in this connection I want to read a letter recently written by former Senator George F. Edmunds, which confirms the position I maintain. The letter is as follows:

AIKEN, S. C., January 2, 1905.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 27th ultimo has reached me here. The statement of Senator Vest contained in the slip you inclose is correct. I have not the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or the Senate files to refer to, but I am sure on looking them up you will find that the bill reported by Mr. Sherman from the Finance Committee was not the one passed by Congress, but that the one passed by Congress was reported by the Judiciary Committee to which the Sherman bill, after it was reported from the Finance Committee and discussed and probably more or less amended, was referred for consideration; and that the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee and passed was in every essential respect entirely different from the Sherman bill, and was purely a substitute for it.

The Judiciary Committee was, I think, unanimously of the opinion that the bill it reported was, in respect of its general scope, an exercise of the whole constitutional power of Congress, which could only legislate for the freedom and regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the several States; and I am of the same opinion still. The only difficulty with the bill we reported and which became law was the want of administration, that is to say, that the law was and is entirely capable of putting an end to such so-called trusts and such combinations as interfere with or restrain commerce among the States, etc. If the officers of the Government having charge of the enforcement of law understand their duty and are willing to do it, being, of course, supplied with sufficient means to put it into force.

If the famous Knight case had been instituted and carried forward with suitable allegations of the precise nature and history of the Knight affair, and had been supported, as it could have been, by adequate proof of the facts it set forth, I believe the Supreme Court of the United States would not have had the least difficulty in preventing the carrying on of the combination under consideration, and putting an end to it, as it can still do with similar ones. The bill of complaint in that case was unhappily not drawn in such a way as to present the question which now so much commands just public concern.

What is needed is not, so much, more legislation as competent and earnest administration of the laws that exist. I have no doubt that the present Attorney-General and his very able assistant will find easy means, if supplied

with the necessary funds, to arrest the progress and undo the mischievous work of such great and injurious combinations as have so largely come into recent existence.

Very truly, yours,

GEO. F. EDMUNDS.

JOHN A. SLEICHER, Esq.,
110 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I have not had and I could not get an opportunity during the general debate to say a word in regard to this bill, and I now ask unanimous consent that my time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may proceed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULZER. I thank the House for its courtesy. As I have said before, and it can not be successfully denied, the law on the statute books against trusts is clear and plain, and the highest court in the land has passed on its validity and sustained the constitutionality of its provisions. The antitrust act of 1890 declares that every contract or combination in the nature of a trust in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States and Territories or with foreign nations is a conspiracy, illegal and void, and punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Under the law of our country trusts are criminal, and there is no distinction between a so-called good trust and a so-called bad trust, between a big trust and a little trust. Every trust is contrary to both the spirit and the letter of the law. To seriously contend otherwise as a legal proposition would be preposterous. If we did so, by analogy we might as consistently assert that there were good pirates and bad pirates. If robbery is criminal, it is immaterial, so far as the crime is concerned, whether the robbery is a big one or a little one. The violation of law is the same.

Under this antitrust act it seems to me every trust in the United States can be prosecuted for violation of law, the charter annulled, and the men behind it punished for conspiracy. Every trust by its very nature is in restraint of trade and commerce and in violation of this law.

If you will read the antitrust act of 1890 and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the trans-Missouri freight case and the Addyston Pipe Line case, the conclusion will be irresistible to the logical mind that the fault is not so much with the law as it is with the men who are sworn to enforce the law. The law so far as it goes is all right—the do-nothing Attorney-General is all wrong. The imperative mandate of the day is "Enforce the law, and every trust in the country will dissolve." Whenever the trusts have been brought before the courts, and their true character shown, they have been declared illegal.

In my opinion—and I say so advisedly—the Department of Justice under the present law can institute and successfully maintain actions against every trust doing business in the United States.

Nothing would be more welcome to the trusts than to change this law—especially its criminal penalties. These, it is true, have never been enforced, but some day the people may get an Attorney-General who will enforce them and if they are enforced a few trust magnates may have to go to jail, and that will be the end of the criminal trusts. One trust magnate behind the bars will

be an object lesson that will do more good than all the speeches ever delivered here against the trusts.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] seems to me to be in an embarrassing position. He changed the title to his bill—he gave up his original bill—and substituted for it a weak, apologetic makeshift that will accomplish nothing or do great harm. Now, I want the members of this House to see how cleverly the trust lawyers amended the title of the original bill. If you will take the title of the original bill introduced by my friend from Maine, you will find it required “all” corporations to make “true” returns, and the trust lawyers some way or other induced the great trust buster from Maine to amend his bill so that it leaves out entirely “all” corporations and “true” returns. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The entire bill—I mean the new trust bill—now before us is a hollow sham.

Mr. Chairman, I had an idea at one time that amounted to almost a conviction that my good-natured friend from Maine was as earnest, as honest, and as sincere a friend of the people and as bitter a foe and as intense an opponent of the trusts and monopolies as I am. [Laughter.] But I am compelled, reluctantly compelled, I regret to say, to be constrained to stand here to-day, after having carefully read the bill originally introduced into this House by the gentleman from Maine and the substitute bill prepared by the trust lawyers, which the gentleman from Maine substituted for his bill, and which he now offers us and stands sponsor for—I am reluctantly constrained, I must confess, to say that this substitute, as a remedy to more effectually curb the power and the sway of the criminal trusts and monopolies, is seven pounds lighter than a straw hat. [Prolonged laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, now, another matter in this connection, somewhat personal, and I dislike exceedingly to refer to myself, but I must. [Laughter] I introduced a bill, an antitrust bill—a real antitrust bill—a bill that would do something and that meant something—a genuine trust-busting antitrust bill, in December, 1902, more than a year ago. I thought my bill, in my modest and humble way, was a better bill than the bill originally introduced by the gentleman from Maine. It was referred to the gentleman’s committee. I went before the gentleman’s committee and made a strong and, if I say it myself, I believe, an eloquent argument in favor of it. I thought at that time the gentleman from Maine liked my bill, perhaps not so much as he did his own creation, but I got the idea that we nearly agreed as to the necessary remedy.

A great many distinguished gentlemen who are opposed to trusts, representing labor organizations, representing the American Antitrust League, representing commercial bodies and other industrial enterprises, also went before the gentleman’s committee and spoke long and earnestly and eloquently in favor of my genuine antitrust bill. The gentleman from Maine intimated substantially that my bill was a most excellent bill, but that he was just a little afraid that it went too far, perhaps, and might hurt the trusts just a little too much, but he in substance suggested that there were features in my bill regarding “publicity” which he thought ought to be incorporated in any bill which the committee reported. That was all very nice—and I thought so then.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to stand up here and say that the gentleman from Maine, my friend, the erstwhile trust buster, did put into his bill some of the provisions of my bill, but they were the mild provisions of my bill which amount to little or nothing. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Maine studiously left out of this bill everything in my bill which would do something, which would amount to something, which would check and cure the trust evil, and which would more effectually curb the potential power and the autocratic sway of the trusts.

Now, another thing—and this is a good time to say it again, and I want to repeat it every chance I get, on behalf of my Democratic colleagues—that when the department of commerce bill was pending in this House I offered my antitrust bill as an amendment to one of the sections of that department of commerce bill, and every Democrat in this House voted for it, and every Republican in this House, including the great, the only, and the original trust buster, my good friend from Maine, voted against it. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] I have noticed, however, that since the department of commerce bill has been pending in the Senate a farseeing and sagacious Senator contemplates amending that bill by incorporating in it an anti-trust provision very similar to mine.

I hope the Senator will do so. He can have my antitrust bill in toto; and I believe it is the best bill ever introduced in this House to establish “publicity” regarding the trusts. I have no personal vanity in this matter. I am only a humble servant of the people, with mediocre ability; and being in the minority, I can not hope to do more than construct legislation. I can only prepare good bills; I can not pass them. Only Republicans can make laws nowadays. But I care not for the glory; all I want is to secure results for the people. [Laughter.]

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we witness quite a spectacle to-day. We see the eloquent former trust buster from Maine now the advocate of the octopus, the historian of monopolies, and the special pleader of the trusts. Perhaps it may be unconscious, but the fact can not be overlooked. And the Republican party, as represented on the floor of this House, has changed its position very materially on this question if you compare the promises made with the meager bill presented. My friends on the other side seem to be running away from the President. I believe the President is honest in his antagonism to the criminal trusts of the country. I believe he is sincere in his recommendations to check their apparent evils. I know he is a true American, and I believe the President wants this Congress to do something to curb the power of the trusts in the interest of the people.

The Republicans pretend that they do also, but you do not carry out your promises or the recommendations of your President. You wink at the exactions of the trusts while you throw a sop to the people in the nature of a futile bill like this that will be just about as effectual to remedy trust evils as a last year's bird's nest. It is apparent you are fooling the people again. You seem to glory in it, and they seem to like it. If it were not for the sadness of it all—the misery, the woe, the want, the poverty of it all—it would be to laugh. Every time I see the Republican elephant at his old tricks I am reminded of what P. T. Barnum facetiously said: “The people like to be humbugged.” The Re-

publican party has evidently copyrighted that remark, and on every occasion religiously lives up to it.

When will the people open their eyes and wake up? How much longer do they want to be humbugged? The President asks for and recommends antitrust legislation, the people all over the land plead for relief from the exactions of the trusts, and the sad experience of the past and the urgent exigencies of the present demand drastic legislation against monopolies and the rigid enforcement of existing laws. But what do you do? What you always do. Fool the people some more. When they ask for bread, you give them something you call bread, but which is really only a stone.

This bill now under discussion will accomplish nothing. It is a misfit, a makeshift, a miscarriage. Its ostensible purpose is to please the people and not displease the trusts. Its hidden object is to strike a deadly blow against the penal penalties of the antitrust act of 1890; and I believe, and I say, that if this bill, with all due respect to the legal ability of my friend from Maine, should become a law in its present shape, it will go far to repeal, by implication, the criminal provisions of the antitrust law of 1890. Why not allow me or some one to amend the bill so that there will be no question about it?

Let me say in this connection that it is remarkable that no Attorney-General, under the provisions of the antitrust law of 1890, has ever instituted a single prosecution to enforce the criminal penalties of that act, and I believe, and I stand up here and assert and defy successful contradiction, that if the Attorney-General would enforce in one prosecution the criminal provisions of the antitrust act of 1890 and put one trust magnate behind prison bars for violation of law it would do more to effectually curb the power and the sway of the trusts than all of the oratory and all of the little pop-gun bills will ever be able to do.

I do not believe this bill that is now before this House, this so-called substitute bill, this bill which really does nothing, will be any more effectual, so far as the enforcement of any remedy is concerned, than if the gentleman from Maine should try to stop the progress of a mad elephant on the rampage with a putty blower. I do not believe this bill is going to accomplish what the country demands. I believe it is really liable to accomplish harm.

I think there ought to be some provision in this bill similar to that which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Hoar] put in his bill—that nothing in this bill should in any way repeal any law now on the statute books against the trusts, so that no matter how the courts may construe this bill, if it becomes a law, there shall be nothing in it by which any part of the civil penalties or the criminal penalties of the act of 1890 shall be repealed or eliminated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a mere makeshift. It is a mere sop to the people. It is what the Republicans always do. They talk all right at the moment. They talk all right during the crisis. They talk all right before the election, but after the crisis is passed, after the election is over, when they begin to legislate they legislate so as to do no injury to those who sustain them, to those who aid them, to those who make large contributions to their campaign fund in every political campaign. It can

not be successfully denied, and it will not be truthfully denied, that every trust in this country, from the greatest to the smallest, in every Congressional, State, and national campaign, makes contributions, some great, some small, to the Republican campaign fund.

I want to say that on account of that fact the intelligent people of this country know that there will never be enacted into law by the Republican party any legislation that will do material harm or substantial injury to the great monopolies, to the great criminal trusts, and to the great corporate wealth of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SULZER. I can only yield a moment—only for a question.

Mr. SIMS. In view of the characterization which you have given this bill, why should any Democrat vote for it?

Mr. SULZER. In my opinion, and I speak only for myself, I care not whether the Democrats vote for this bill or against it. I think it is the poorest apology for antitrust legislation that the mighty legal mind of the gentleman from Maine could possibly devise, and I think it has made a great giant—a valiant trust fighter—look exceedingly small, almost a pigmy. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

THE PUERTO RICO TARIFF.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, February 23, 1900.

WASHINGTON.
1900.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 8245) to regulate the trade of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill is radically wrong in principle, against common sense on its face, clearly contrary to the dictates of humanity, and absolutely in violation of the letter and the spirit of the Federal Constitution. It seeks to extend to a limited degree the Dingley tariff law to the goods, wares, and merchandise of the people of the island of Puerto Rico, which island is now, and for some time past has been, a part of the territory of the United States.

It imposes a tariff tax on all merchandise coming into the United States from Puerto Rico, and going into that island from the United States, at a rate equal to 25 per cent of the duties collected on merchandise imported into the United States from foreign countries; and further provides that duties collected in United States ports upon manufactured goods from Puerto Rico shall be equal in rate and amount to the internal-revenue tax imposed by the United States upon the same articles manufactured in the United States, and in addition thereto 25 per cent of the duties now collected by law upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries, and that duties collected in the island upon manufactured goods from the United States shall be equal to the internal-revenue tax imposed in Puerto Rico upon articles manufactured therein, and in addition thereto 25 per cent of the duties now collected by law upon like articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries.

In my opinion this bill violates the traditional policy of the Government, strikes a cruel blow against a portion of the people of our country, and makes a discrimination as unwise as it is inhuman

and unjust. It is one of the most iniquitous bills ever introduced in this House. I am unalterably opposed to this kind of legislation, and shall vote against this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman except the money bill?

Mr. SULZER. I said it was "one" of the most iniquitous bills ever introduced, and I repeat it.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, that is a stock phrase.

Mr. SULZER. That may be, but your legislation warrants it, and the word is none too strong and, to my mind, can not be too often used to fitly express your action here. You trample under foot the Constitution, and you ride roughshod over the rights of the people. The currency bill is an infamous financial job. This bill is an infamous tariff job, and they are both inherently iniquitous.

Now, Mr. Chairman, since the ratification of the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States the island of Puerto Rico has been and is now a part of the domain and territory of this country, and the Constitution applies to it, and should apply to it, just as much as it applies to the District of Columbia or the Territory of Arizona. To contend otherwise is as preposterous as it is untenable.

The people of Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States and entitled to the same privileges, the same rights, and the same immunities under the Constitution that the people of any other State or Territory are entitled to in the Federal Union. This bill compelling the citizens of Puerto Rico to pay a tariff tax on their goods, wares, and merchandise to and from this country is unwarranted, unjustifiable, unprecedented, un-American, and, in my judgment, unconstitutional. In all our past history no political party ever dared to attempt to pass a bill like this, a bill as inhuman as it is unfair, a bill that discriminates by special legislation against the people of one section of the country in regard to impost taxes.

The Constitution regarding this matter is clear and plain. Section 8 of Article I says in language that can not be misunderstood:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; * * * but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

This provision of the Constitution has been passed upon and interpreted again and again by the United States Supreme Court, and from the days of John Marshall down to the present time the highest court in all our land has always held that the laying and collecting of impost duties must be uniform throughout the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose and I have not the time to review the authorities. I shall content myself by referring to a few of the more important of them. John Marshall, in delivering the opinion of the court in the case of *Loughborough vs. Blake* (5 Wheaton, page 319), said of the clause of the Constitution requiring uniformity of duties, excises, and imposts throughout the United States—the very clause involved in this bill:

The power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises may be exercised and must be exercised throughout the United States. Does this term designate the whole or any part of the United States? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the Territory west of Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania, and it is not less necessary, on the principles of our Constitution, that uniformity in the imposition of imposts, duties, and excises shall be observed in the one than the other.

In the case of *Cross vs. Harrison* (16 Howard, 198) the court clearly considered the territory embraced in California as a part of the United States within the meaning of this same clause of the Constitution.

I am unable to find any support in judicial decisions for the doctrine that the inhabitants of Territories have no constitutional rights, but exist only by the will of Congress. On the other hand, it has been repeatedly held by the Supreme Court that Congress is bound by the restrictions of the Constitution in dealing with Territories. The broadest construction I have been able to discover, given by any decision of the Supreme Court to the legislative power of Congress over Territories, is set forth in the *Canter* case, and holds in effect that Congress possesses the powers of the General Government and also the powers of a State legislature unrestrained by a State constitution. This interpretation would still leave Congress subject to those limitations which are imposed by the Constitution upon both the national and the State governments. Since the National Government is required to observe the rule of uniformity in levying duties, excises, and imposts, and

the States are substantially prohibited from levying such taxes, it follows that Congress has no power to tax thus unequally either in its capacity as a national or a State legislature.

Daniel Webster spoke directly upon the very proposition involved in this bill. On the 23d of March, 1848, he said in the United States Senate:

An arbitrary government may have territorial governments in distant possessions. because an arbitrary government may rule its distant territories by different laws and different systems. Russia may govern the Ukraine and the Caucasus and Kamchatka by different codes or ukases. We can do no such thing. They must be of us—part of us—or else estranged. I think I see, then, in progress what is to disfigure and deform the Constitution. * * * I think I see a course adopted that is likely to turn the Constitution under which we live into a deformed monster—into a curse rather than a blessing—into a great frame of unequal government, not founded on popular representation, but founded in the grossest inequalities; and I think if it go on, for there is a great danger that it will go on, that this Government will be broken up.

Numerous recent decisions recognize the doctrine that Territories are infant States. Among them are the following:

In *Weber against Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wallace, 65) Justice Field said:

Although the title to the soil under tide waters of the bay was acquired by the cession from Mexico equally with the title to the upland, they held it only in trust for the future States.

And in *Knight vs. United States Land Association* (142 United States, page 183) Justice Lamar said:

Upon the acquisition of the territory from Mexico the United States acquired the title to the tide lands equally with the title to the upland, but with respect to the former they held it only in trust for the future States that might be erected out of such territory.

In *Shively vs. Bowlby* (152 United States, 48) Justice Gray reiterated the doctrine of *Knight against United States and Weber against Harbor Commissioners*.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the true theory is that the Constitution applies to the entire domain of the United States, and while the power of Congress over the Territories is plenary, this term is only used in connection with the Territorial and municipal government which must be conducted under the authority of Congress. Congress thus possesses a power over the Territories which it does not possess over the States; but so far as the Federal powers are concerned, they operate equally over the States

and Territories and are to be exercised with regard to the prohibitions and limitations of the Constitution.

This is stated in *National Bank vs. County of Yankton* (101 U. S.), in which Chief Justice Waite, after stating that Territories are but political subdivisions of the outlying domain of the United States, said, with reference to the organic law of a Territory:

It is obligatory on and binds the Territorial authorities, but Congress is supreme, and for the purposes of this department of its governmental authority has all the powers of the people of the United States, except such as have been expressly or by implication reserved in the prohibitions of the Constitution.

In *Reynolds vs. United States* (98 U. S., 162) the court says:

Congress can not pass a law for the government of the Territories which shall prohibit the free exercise of religion. The first amendment to the Constitution expressly forbids such legislation.

In *Springville vs. Thomas* (166 U. S., 707) the court says:

In our opinion the seventh amendment secured unanimity in finding a verdict as an essential feature of trial by jury in common-law cases. The act of Congress could not impart the power to change the constitutional rule and could not be treated as attempting to do so.

In *Thompson vs. Utah* (170 U. S., 346) Justice Harlan said:

That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to the right of trial by jury in suits at common law apply to the Territories of the United States is no longer an open question.

In *Murphy vs. Ramsey* (114 U. S., 15) the court says:

The people of the United States, as sovereign owners of the national Territories, have supreme power over them and their inhabitants. In the exercise of this sovereign dominion they are represented by the Government of the United States, to whom all the powers of the Government over that subject have been delegated, subject only to such restrictions as are expressed in the Constitution or are necessarily implied in its terms.

Now, sir, it being conceded that Puerto Rico is a part of the domain of the United States, and the Constitution enjoining that all impost taxes shall be uniform throughout the United States, it appears to me that this bill levying impost taxes of 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff rates against the goods, wares, and merchandise of the citizens of Puerto Rico is, and in the name of common sense, justice, and humanity ought to be, unconstitutional, and if the bill ever passes I trust, I hope, and I believe the courts will declare it unconstitutional and absolutely null and void.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; if it is not too long.

Mr. RAY of New York. I hold in my hand a book which contains a decision of the Supreme Court which overrules John Marshall.

Mr. SULZER. Well, God forbid that you should ever overrule him. [Laughter.] John Marshall was one of the greatest jurists that ever sat on the bench of the United States Supreme Court, and in this matter, with all due respect to my colleague from New York and the book he holds in his hand, I prefer to follow the judgment of John Marshall.

Mr. RAY of New York. I am surprised at the ignorance of gentlemen on that side of the House, and some on this side, on this question.

Mr. SULZER. Well, then, I will say that no one is surprised at your knowledge of the law. [Laughter and applause.] And to satisfy you I will now admit that you know more law than the Supreme Court ever knew or ever will know.

Mr. NEVILLE. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. NEVILLE. If the Republican theory is correct, that the foreigners pay the tax, how can the Republicans claim to be good Samaritans and at the same time impose a tax on the Puerto Ricans?

Mr. SULZER. That is an ethical question, and I respectfully submit it to my good friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. But let me tell you now that no Republican will answer it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I agree with the President. In a political way we differ materially in regard to legislation for the best interests of the people; but in regard to this legislation for Puerto Rico, if the President meant what he said in his annual message to Congress, I agree with him. Let me read what the President said to Congress regarding this matter at the beginning of this session of Congress:

It is our plain duty to abolish all customs tariffs between the United States and Puerto Rico and give her products free access to our markets.

This he said was necessary because the island—

had been denied the principal markets she had long enjoyed, and our tariffs have been continued against her products as when she was under Spanish

sovereignty: that the markets of Spain are closed to her products except upon terms to which the commerce of all nations is subjected. The island of Cuba, which used to buy her cattle and tobacco without customs duties, now imposes the same duties upon these products as from any other country entering her ports. She has therefore lost her free intercourse with Spain and Cuba without any compensating benefits in this market. The markets of the United States should be opened up to her products.

The Secretary of War in his annual report uses the following language:

The highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectation of sharing in our prosperity with which the people of Puerto Rico so gladly transferred their allegiance to the United States, and that we should treat the interest of this people as our own; and I wish most strongly to urge that the customs duties between Puerto Rico and the United States be removed.

And as late as the 19th of January, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. PAYNE, declared by the introduction of House bill 6883, for which the pending bill is offered as a substitute, against the policy of this bill and in favor of free trade between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Now, sir, I concur in the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of War, that it is our plain duty not to enact a tariff law against Puerto Rico, but give her products free access to our markets; and that the dictates of humanity and the highest considerations of justice and good faith demand that we should not disappoint the confident expectations of the poor people of that beautiful gem of the Antilles—Puerto Rico.

If this bill should pass, the President can not consistently sign it, if he were honest and sincere in what he said in his message to Congress.

The overwhelming sentiment of the American people is against the passage of this bill, and in the face of that sentiment and the President's recommendation to Congress I would like some Republican to explain to me and the country the reasons why the Republican majority in this House are resorting to every conceivable expedient to enact this outrageous and unjust measure into law? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When this Puerto Rico tariff bill was introduced, it abolished all customs tariffs between that island and the United States; but when it was reported by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee it raised a customs barrier of 25 per cent against the

poor people of Puerto Rico. Why the change? Did the President ask it? Did the Secretary of War ask it? Did the people of Puerto Rico ask it? No; absolutely no! The people of the island of Puerto Rico strenuously object and urgently protest against the passage of this bill, and, so far as we are aware, the President has not changed his mind, although we know from experience that mind is like a weather vane, changing with every puff of political wind.

Why, then, was the change made? Well, it is said, and not denied, that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee made this change at the request of the sugar trust, the tobacco trust, and the whisky trust. I believe this to be the truth about the matter.

The agents of the trusts dictated this unjust discrimination against the citizens of Puerto Rico, and seem to have more power and more influence here than the American people. You dare not disobey the trusts. They own and control the Republican party. They are in the saddle and they are riding the Republican party to destruction. They make you sneer at the will of the people; they make you laugh at law and public opinion; they make you violate the imperative injunctions of the Constitution in order to obey their selfish dictates of sordid greed.

Now, sir, I would like to ask my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, what he would do if the agents of the trusts should come here and demand a tariff of 25 per cent against the goods and merchandise of the people of New York, or the people of Illinois, or the people of Oklahoma? Would he dare pass a bill laying tribute on the products of the people of those States? I think not. Would such a bill be considered just or constitutional? I think not. And yet would not such a bill be just as reasonable, just as sensible, and just as constitutional as the bill now under consideration? I can see no material difference.

The case seems to be analogous. As the Supreme Court has said, all impost taxes must be uniform throughout the United States, and to-day Puerto Rico is just as much a part of the United States as Alaska or the District of Columbia. In my opinion this proposition is incontrovertible, and this inhuman discrim-

ination against the poor people of Puerto Rico is a Republican outrage, an act of unparalleled injustice, a shameful protective-tariff crime, and all done by the Republican party to please the sugar trust, to placate the tobacco trust, and to paralyze the struggling industries of Puerto Rico.

Pass this cruel, this heartless bill, and what will the 1,000,000 starving human beings in Puerto Rico think of us? Will they not wish they were back in Spain? Will it not be a just cause for continued complaint? And will they not cry out against the injustice and truthfully say, in the words of the patriot fathers, "No taxation without representation?" Spain would never treat one of her colonies as we now propose to treat the poor Puerto Ricans. What will the people down there think of our boasted civilization and of our superior free institutions? What an object lesson to the world this bill presents of Republican duplicity, Republican injustice, and Republican subserviency to the sordid greed of the monopolistic trusts.

The other day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the spokesman of the Administration, said regarding this bill and the islands which came to us by reason of the treaty of peace with Spain:

We have got them, and we are going to take care of them. We are going to make all the money out of the transaction we can.

That sums the whole question up in a single sentence. The Republican party is going to make all the money out of the transaction it can. It is going to exploit the islands ceded to us by Spain and make all the money out of them it can. This is not expansion; it is imperialistic piracy—the meanest and most inhuman kind of robbery, because it not alone beggars the present generation but entails woe and misery on millions yet unborn, and does it all under the flag of the Republic and in the name of freedom and justice, magnanimity and benevolent assimilation. What an inspiring spectacle of false pretense and hypocrisy the Republican party presents to-day in its unconstitutional march to empire!

The citizens of Puerto Rico are an intelligent, honest, peaceable, law-abiding people. Recently they were visited by a frightful hurricane which did great damage to the property of the island,

and they are now poor and sorely distressed. We should, if we are true to ourselves, give to them instead of taking from them. Governor-General Davis, in his last report to the War Department, said:

I regard free trade between Puerto Rico and the United States as a necessity.

Pass this bill to loot them, and in all the years to come what will they think of us? The Republican party has deprived them of self-government and given them a military government. They have no representation here. Under Spanish rule they were represented by twelve representatives and four senators in the Spanish Cortes. They had their own local legislature and absolute home rule. Why, under the circumstances, I ask, in the name of all that is fair and just and decent, should we now tax them and rob them of the little they have? Have we made their condition better or worse?

Have we liberated them from monarchical tyranny only to enslave them in industrial oppression? The poor people of Puerto Rico will speak, and the great heart of the Republic will answer and respond in the coming campaign. The American people will never repeat in the dying year of the nineteenth century the crimes and the blunders of George the Third in the closing years of the eighteenth century. We have not forgotten our past. The spirit of 1776 still lives, and the American people will ere long again vindicate the immortal principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence. In the sisterhood of States there must be no stepdaughters. The flag we all love must not be used as a cloak to rob and oppress our fellow-citizens at the dictation of the trusts and to bolster up the falling Republican protective tariff fallacy.

Mr. Chairman, I speak earnestly on this subject. My sympathy is with the struggling citizens of Puerto Rico. I want to extend to them the right hand of fellowship, and under the folds of the American flag and by virtue of the law of the land welcome them into the Federal Union. I want to help them, and not injure them. I want to save them, and not destroy them. I want them to love the Union, not hate us and despise our institutions.

I want to keep faith with them and do unto them as we would

that others should do unto us. The act you do to-day is a criminal act of Republican spoliation, and the consequences will be more far-reaching and more destructive than you now imagine. It is another step in your mad march toward imperialism and the subversion of our free institutions. I protest against it with all the emphasis I can command, and I solemnly warn my countrymen that the day is not far distant when the Republic will be destroyed if the wrongs and the usurpations of the Republican party are allowed to go unheeded, unchecked, and unrebuked.

The manhood of this country must speak out, the great conscience of America must find voice, the citizenship of the Republic must assert itself, ere it be too late and ere all is lost. Let us be honest, let us be fair, let us be just, let us be true to our past, true to ourselves, and it will follow like the night the day we can not then be false to any citizen in all the broad domain of our great and glorious Republic.

In the contest which is now on between the Republic and the empire I take my stand with the people against empire and in favor of the perpetuity of the Republic. Ours is the great Republic, the beacon light of the world, the refuge of the oppressed of every clime, the home for the downtrodden of every land, and it is incumbent and a sacred and imperative duty on those who are here and enjoying the inestimable blessings of our free institutions to see to it that the Government of Jefferson, of Jackson, and of Lincoln does not perish from the earth. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

THE NEW POST-OFFICE IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, March 3, 1903.

WASHINGTON.

1903.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House having under consideration the bill (S. 6702) granting a pension to Emily Lawrence Reed—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not my intention to discuss the merits of the pending pension bill, save to say that it will have my sincere support and that I trust it will pass the House without opposition. My purpose now, sir, in accepting the time courteously yielded to me by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] is to fix the responsibility for the elimination of the \$2,000,000 appropriation in the sundry civil bill to purchase a site for a new post-office in the city of New York. I want the people who are most interested in this post-office matter to understand the situation here, and I believe when they do they will not blame the Representatives in Congress from the city of New York for the delays and the failures which thus far have attended the proposition.

Mr. Speaker, when the conferees' report on the sundry civil bill was before the House for approval a little while ago I endeavored to get a few minutes' time from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who controlled all the time, to briefly express my opinion and voice the sentiments of my constituents regarding the appropriation for the new post-office in the city of New York. I had been informed that the appropriation for \$2,000,000 put in that bill at our request by the Senate would be held in the bill by the House conferees, and I only learned after the conferees had agreed that the appropriation of \$2,000,000 to purchase the site in the city of New York for the new post-office building had been stricken out. The gentleman from Illinois declined to let me be heard then. He did not want the matter discussed, and I was denied the right to be heard. The gentleman from Illinois declined at that time to give me a moment's time, and I am compelled to avail myself of this opportunity to say briefly what I wish to say regarding this matter.

The city of New York, which I have the honor to represent in part on the floor of this House, is the richest city in the world, the most populous city on this continent, and the metropolis of our country. Every citizen in all our land has every reason to feel a just pride in the commercial greatness of the Empire City, and it seems to be a remarkable fact and a most humiliating condition of affairs here that no matter what the great city of New York wants or how badly something there is needed, it can have no relief, it can get no aid from the Congress of the United States. The greatest city in our country is and always has been studiously ignored by the National Legislature. The way we are treated here is an outrage, and I say it has got to stop.

For years, Mr. Speaker, the people of New York City have been making a determined, but a fruitless, effort to get a new post-

office, and the Representatives of that city in this House, in season and out of season, month in and month out, have done everything in their power to secure the necessary legislation; but all in vain. We have pleaded and begged and appealed, but without avail. Congress seems to be deaf to the supplications of the first city in the land. The humblest hamlet in any State can get a Federal building or a magnificent post-office for the mere asking, but New York City can not have simple justice in a matter of the greatest urgency and necessity and that affects more or less every other part of our entire country and all the people. It is strange; but, then, there is a reason for it.

The present post-office building in the city of New York is a disgrace to the Federal Government. It is old, damp, worn-out, overcrowded, and dilapidated. It is totally unfit to properly transact its immense postal business. It was built many years ago, and its usefulness is now practically a thing of the past. New York City to-day is more in need of better post-office facilities than any other city in the United States. This old post-office building away down town is wholly inadequate, and has been so for years, to properly handle and distribute the vast amount of mail that comes in and goes out of the great metropolis. It is damp and dirty and dingy. It is cramped and clammy and unhealthy. The Government employees there, compelled to work underground, are daily endangering their health and risking their lives, and are so crowded for lack of space and necessary room that it is impossible to expedite the distribution of important mail matter; and this deplorable situation affects, I say, not only the people in the city of New York, but the people all over the country, because it is well known that New York City is our greatest postal distributor.

Mr. Speaker, the post-office of New York City pays the Government an immense revenue profit every year; more, I believe, than any other three cities in the land and more than many States of the Union. The net annual revenue from the New York City post-office is about \$6,000,000, and increasing more and more every year. With these apparent facts staring us in the face, it is a shame, in my judgment, that for this reason or that excuse it has been absolutely impossible for the people of New York City, or their representatives in Congress, to get Congress to remedy the postal evils in New York City and give the people there a post-office that will reflect credit on the Federal Government and facilitate the distribution of the mails.

It is well known, Mr. Speaker, to those members familiar with this question that after several years of weary effort and arduous struggle we finally succeeded in getting the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of this House to pass a law merely appointing a commission composed of the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Attorney-General to go to New York City and select a suitable site for the new post-office building. No appropriation to pay for the site was made in this law, because we were told such a proposition was unheard of and contrary to precedent, and that no appropriation was ever made by Congress until the site was selected, and that just so soon as the site was selected Congress would forthwith appropriate all necessary money to pay for the same and to begin the construction of the building.

That is all we could then do, and so we waited patiently for the commission to get to work and select the site. For some occult reason, inscrutable to the uninitiated, no doubt, the commission seemed to be dilatory, and for months did nothing. Some unknown, intangible, mysterious agency was at work to thwart the will of the people of the city of New York and prevent the commission from speedily selecting a proper site; but everything comes to an end and to those that wait, and just before this Congress was about to adjourn the commission sent to us what purported to be its report regarding the selection of the site. We could do nothing but wait, we were told over and over again, until the commission made its report. We were powerless. The report, however, came at last. It was sent here only a few days ago, after the sundry civil bill, which had to carry the appropriation, had passed the House of Representatives and was in the Senate. Was this by design? But, nevertheless, just so soon as the report came to Congress we went to work, and after much effort succeeded in getting the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to consent to put in the bill in the Senate an appropriation for two millions to purchase the site and begin to do something.

Now, I want to say the site selected is not to the liking of the people of New York City. It is in the most out-of-the-way place, and was selected, I am told, to placate the Pennsylvania Railroad. But be that as it may, we got the appropriation on the bill in the Senate and began to look forward with some degree of expectancy to the beginning of the new post-office in our city that would reflect credit on the Government and be commensurate with the wealth, the population, and the commercial supremacy of our metropolis. But, alas, again we were doomed to sorrowful disappointment. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues from Indiana and Arkansas, composing the conference committee on the part of the House, who have not a city in their districts with a population as large as that contained in the smallest borough of New York City, did not think the time was quite at hand for the Government to pay for the site or to begin the building. The site might be changed, don't you know. And, again, it might not be suitable after all. But if it were to be the site finally, nothing could be done until the Pennsylvania Railroad got its tunnel into the city and the excavations made for its terminal. Besides this, Congress had appropriated enough money—over a billion and a half of dollars—and it was time enough anyway to consider this in the next Congress.

And then, again, New York City is too far away from the districts of these gentlemen for them to know much about this site or to care much about it, and they must go there and see for themselves. Perhaps they have never been to New York and want to go there semiofficially and find out a little about it, and learn for themselves if the people are so anxious and if there is an imperative need of a new post-office. Then, again, another railroad company was jealous of the influence of the Pennsylvania. It wanted a site, too, forsooth. It protested. And so the appropriation went out. We were powerless. We did all we could. Now, I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that some of the commissioners designated to select the site never saw the site finally agreed on. One of these commissioners, I am told, was never in the part of our city where the site is located. But, be this as it

may, I care not, the important thing now that I wish to impress on this House and the people of New York City, is that the conferees on the part of this House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE], made a determined fight in conference to strike out this appropriation of \$2,000,000, notwithstanding our pleading and protest, and then when they brought the conference report back into the House they refused to give a New York member the opportunity to say a single word in explanation.

Were they afraid to have this matter discussed in the open? Were they sensitive to criticism which they knew must follow their betrayal and inexplicable action? Or, were they being used merely as "cat's paws" of conflicting railroad interests, that would rather have no post-office at all in New York City, unless it can be placed where they desire? I want the people of New York City to understand that the reason this appropriation was stricken out, and the cause for the delay in getting the new post-office and better postal facilities, is the great railroad interests at stake, which have not yet been harmonized, and until their wishes are complied with the people must wait.

While the conflict of railroad interests has been going on "dust has been thrown in the eyes of the people," and everything has been done to retard this great public necessity, and I say now to the newspapers of New York City and to the people there, some of whom have wondered, no doubt, why their representatives were unable to get this appropriation for the new post-office, that we never will be able to get it until the conflicting railroad and other selfish and personal interests are satisfied and withdraw their opposition. This is the truth and all there is about it. While the conflict rages as to where the new post-office site shall be and which corporation will benefit the most by it, everything will remain at a practical standstill, and there will be in our city no new post-office. Let the great metropolitan newspapers look beneath the surface in this matter and they will have no difficulty in fixing the responsibility. I do not care to indulge in further criticism, although I could, or censure those who have stood in the way, although any man familiar with the circumstances involved in this long delay, who has witnessed the cunning and the chicanery of the agents here of selfish interests and the manipulations which have been going on for years regarding this very important matter, knows as much about it as I do, and I trust the press of New York City will look into the matter a little deeper than they have heretofore and place the responsibility where it justly belongs.

Now, sir, I want to say again in conclusion in behalf of my colleagues of New York City that they are not responsible—they have done all in their power, no men could do more—but the sad truth is we are in a hopeless minority and impotent to legislate for our city except with the consent of the majority; and that majority—the Republicans—will do nothing for the Democratic city of New York, especially if it will conflict with the grasping greed of monopoly and the sordid interests of the railroads that want the new post-office site located at their terminals or not at all, and their agents here have apparently more influence with the Republican majority in Congress than the just demands of all the people of New York City and their representatives included.

CUBAN RECIPROCITY.

The Democratic Party is in favor of reducing taxes
on the necessities of life.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, November 19, 1903.

WASHINGTON.

1903.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Cuban reciprocity bill, now under consideration in this House, is a step in the right direction, and I shall vote for it for that reason.

Let me say at the outset that I am in favor of reciprocity—not halfway reciprocity, not pretended reciprocity, but true, real reciprocity; Democratic reciprocity, that will accomplish something for the consumer; reciprocity that will mean something to our manufacturers; reciprocity that will continue to develop and build up our growing trade in a greater commercial way with all our neighbors on the Western Hemisphere and give us a more commanding trade position of a reciprocal character with Canada, Mexico, the West Indies, and the Central and South American States. We need the raw material and we want the products of these countries. They want our manufactured goods. True and honest reciprocity with them will benefit our manufacturers, help our consumers, and be of inestimable advantage to those countries and their industrious inhabitants. "Live and let live" should be our national motto regarding trade and commerce.

Reciprocity along these lines is true tariff reform, a bright harbinger of better commercial days, a firm step forward in the right direction, and the knitting together in closer ties of political friendship and more amicable trade relations of all the people in North and South America.

Let me say now that this bill is not perfect. It does not go far enough to meet my sanguine expectations. I indulged the hope of better things from the Republicans in this House, and believed that they would rise to the occasion, comply with the wishes of the great majority of the American people, meet the Cubans halfway, and deal fairly and honestly and justly with Cuba, so that true reciprocal trade relations would for all time be firmly established between the two Republics.

It is a matter, in my opinion, to be regretted, Mr. Chairman, that this bill can not now be amended and perfected by the real friends of reciprocity in this House who want to help Cuba onward and upward, and at the same time benefit our manufacturers and consumers. But the political oligarchy that controls the proceedings in the House of Representatives has decreed otherwise, and we are compelled to take this bill with all its imperfections, with all its limitations, and with all its meager concessions, just as it is.

At the very beginning of this discussion the Committee on Rules, composed of three Republican Members of this House,

brought in a cast-iron gag rule, which the majority adopted supinely and obsequiously, notwithstanding the earnest protest of every Democrat here assembled. The adoption of this rule makes it impossible for us to offer an amendment to this measure, and at the end of a few days' debate forces us to vote for or against the bill just as it came from the Ways and Means Committee. We are prevented from perfecting the bill. We are shut off from offering a single amendment. Any motion is quickly ruled "out of order," and we must take the bill or leave it, just as a few Republicans on the committee which reported it desire.

Such a proceeding is a travesty on intelligent legislation, violates all parliamentary precedent, and makes a farce of the popular branch of the lawmaking power.

I protest against this tyrannical rule. It makes the Members of this House mere automata, legislation here a laughingstock, and representative government a stumbling-block. We have 388 Members in this House, and 385 of them by virtue of these gag rules are simply figureheads. We sit here day in and day out simply to vote now and then "yea" or "nay." We are the playthings of a legislative triumvirate. This Committee on Rules, composed of the Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], practically runs the House. These three Members are omnipotent—we propose and they dispose. That is about all there is to-day to the historic House of Representatives. We might as well stay home and delegate to the Committee on Rules the little privilege we have left, to cast our votes. The House of Representatives is no longer a deliberative body. It is the creature of this legislative triumvirate. We have no chance to construct legislation; no opportunity to perfect contemplated laws. If we have ability and desire to initiate and have considered legislation demanded by our constituents and the people generally, we can not do so. A minority Member has to-day no opportunity in this House, and a majority Member very little. No other parliamentary body in the world would tolerate the gag-act proceedings of the three Republican Members of the anomalous Committee on Rules. It is a disgrace to our manhood, an insult to our intelligence, an assault on our legislative rights, a blow to parliamentary government, and a perversion of the Constitution. How much longer shall we submit to it? How much longer shall this triumvirate continue? For one, I am tired of it. I cry out against it, and say it must be stopped. It can be stopped if we assert our rights and have the courage to maintain them.

Now, sir, I say this and I mean it—I shall continue to say it just so long as the Republican gag rule is enforced. I wanted to offer several amendments to this bill. In the first place, I wished to amend the bill by reducing the tariff tax one-half on all goods, wares, and merchandise going into Cuba from this country or coming into this country from Cuba. This bill proposes a reduction of 20 per cent of existing tariff taxes. I am in favor of a 50 per cent reduction. That would be little enough, and it would do some good and mean real reciprocity. Here is an opportunity to secure genuine reciprocity. I want to offer this amendment making the tariff-tax reduction 50 per cent instead of 20 per cent, as proposed in the bill, but the Republicans refuse to permit me to do it. Why? Because they fear it might be agreed to, and

that, forsooth, would hurt some sheltered monopoly entrenched behind their high protective-tariff walls. How much longer will the American people be deceived by Republican hypocrisy regarding the tariff-made trusts?

In the second place, I intended to propose an amendment to the bill, striking out the differential and eliminating the color restriction now in the present law on sugar imported into this country from Cuba. If this were done, there would be no shelter to monopoly, competition in the manufacture of sugar would be free and untrammelled, and the price of sugar to the consumer materially reduced. Sugar is one of the necessities of life. Its price is one of the great items of household expenses to every family in the land. There is a tariff tax of about \$7 a barrel on sugar under the present law. This tax is a hunger tax. It is a Republican tariff tax. The consumer pays it. It should be repealed. There should be no tax on sugar. If this tax were taken off, the price of sugar in this country to the consumer would be reduced about one-half—quite an item of expense to every household. Here is an opportunity to give cheaper sugar to the consumers of our country, but the Republicans oppose it and decline to permit us to offer the amendment for fear it will be adopted. You are afraid to go on record on this question. What a spectacle! The Democratic party is in favor of reducing taxes on the necessities of life. The Republican party is opposed to all tariff-tax reduction, even where the tariff shelters monopoly. No tinkering with the tariff is the mandate of the Republican party even where trust-made goods are sold by tariff-protected industries cheaper in foreign countries than at home. The tariff is a tax on consumption, and the consumer pays the tax. This high protective tariff question, which robs the many for the benefit of the few, is one of the leading issues between the Democratic and Republican parties, and will be submitted to the people in the next national campaign for their decision.

Another amendment, sir, I proposed to offer to this bill is to the effect that all goods, wares, and merchandise going into Cuba from the United States, or coming into this country from Cuba, shall be carried in American or Cuban ships—built in Cuba or the United States, carrying the American or the Cuban flag, and manned by Cuban or American sailors. If this amendment were adopted it would do something to aid the restoration of the American merchant marine. Republican policies have driven American ships and the American flag from the high seas.

Here is an opportunity, to some extent, to restore the flag to the ocean, but the Republicans refuse to permit me to offer the amendment. Why? Because the Republican Members would not dare to go on record in this House against restoring the American flag and American ships to the high seas. What a spectacle of commercial selfishness, monopolistic greed, and political shortsightedness the Republican party in this House presents to-day! The Republican Members of the House do not dare to go on record against these suggested amendments. They seek refuge in the gag rule of the legislative triumvirate, which protects them from going on record, and makes legislation in this House a sham and a farce. The Republicans are in the majority here. They are responsible to the people for this condition of affairs. The minority Members are precluded from offering a

single amendment. We are compelled to vote for or against this bill just as it comes from the committee. It is an outrage, and I protest against it.

Notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Chairman, that I am prevented from offering the amendments I have referred to, it is my intention to vote for this bill on the theory that half a loaf is better than no bread, and that a step in the right direction is better than standing still. I believe that reciprocal commerce between this country and Cuba and Canada and our immediate neighbors in Central and South America should be as free and untrammelled as possible, consistent with the needs of revenue for economical governmental administration, and with a view of not disturbing honest industry or legitimate effort among our own producers and manufacturers. I trust the day is not far distant when we shall have reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada, with Mexico, with the West Indies, and with all the Central and South American Republics. We should make it to the interest of these countries to trade with us, and the self-interest established by reciprocal trade will ever constitute the strongest tie of lasting friendship, of permanent peace, and of material prosperity for all concerned.

Last spring, Mr. Chairman, I visited Cuba, and was greatly impressed by all I saw during my sojourn there. It is a genial land of sunshine and shadow—a veritable wonderland—rich in natural resources beyond the dreams of avarice. It is a great field for the man who wants to get on and succeed. No one need ever be hungry in Cuba. Her climate is ideal; her skies more beautiful than Italy's; her days an everlasting summer's dream; her air the most healthful in the world; her people generous, courteous, and hospitable; her valleys the garden of the Lord; her landscape so beautiful no painter can picture it and no poet adequately describe it. Cuba is the land of perpetual flowers, of stately royal palms, the Bohemia of the dreamer, generous in tropical fruits, the home for the painter and the poet, the paradise of all the islands of the sea—one long, harmonious, brilliant, indescribable mental melody. It will soon become the greatest winter resort in the world. As Mr. James Gordon Bennett said to me in Habana, in beauty, climate, and scenery, Cuba far surpasses the Riviera or any other part of the Mediterranean. I was impressed most favorably by everything I saw in Cuba. The climate so dreamy and so salubrious; the indescribable beauty of the magnificent scenery—odoriferous forever and a day with enchanting and entrancing perfumes; her vast undeveloped resources; the richness of the soil; her quaint towns and cities and villages resplendent in subdued colors of pale pink and lemon yellow and baby blue—remindful of the Orient—and full in every place with historical reminiscences bringing to memory myriads of patriotic thoughts and to recollection hundreds of heroic deeds from the days of Columbus to the present time. And then the quiet—the peaceableness of her people, so law-abiding and so different from the helter-skelter turmoil, the nervous hurry, and the everlasting rush of the people of higher latitudes.

The Cubans have many problems to work out as the youngest Republic in the world, but destiny is with them and they will solve all difficulties of self-government successfully. I have no fears for the Republic of Cuba. It has taken its place among the nations of the earth, and success, happiness, contentment, and

prosperity will ever follow its bright new flag; and the island country will as the years come and go become greater and grander and more glorious—a gladsome demonstration that the Cubans are capable of self-government and have the ability to work out unaided and alone their own future.

Tomas Estrada Palma is making a splendid President of Cuba. He is the right man in the right place. His administration is giving general satisfaction among all the people throughout the island, and under his sagacious and patriotic guidance the Cuban Republic is moving along successfully and harmoniously. Great credit is due President Palma. He is Cuba's first, and will go into history as one of her greatest, Executives. He has the absolute confidence of everyone, and is doing an enormous work with a quiet heroism that commands respect and speaks more eloquently than words for Cuba's radiant future.

The Cubans welcome capital from the States to invest there and encourage in every way in their power northern progress and energy and enterprise. They know it is to their advantage. They realize its benefits. They see what Mr. Van Horne has accomplished in two years for their country. He has opened up Cuba's possibilities with a wand of magic, built and equipped a modern railroad from the west to the east, made Habana and Santiago walk hand in hand—sister provinces—added millions and millions of untold wealth to her values, made possible thousands and thousands of new homes and new towns, annihilated distance and made the Cubans, from one end of the island to the other, united and one. He has done and is doing a wonderful work for Cuba. No one who has not been there can fully conceive it. But the far-seeing Cubans fully appreciate it. Mr. Van Horne is today Cuba's pioneer of progress, the advance agent of her coming higher civilization, the helper of humanity, the guide of the coming generations, who blazes the trail through the primeval forests that happiness may follow his handiwork.

Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate what I have frequently said before on this floor, that I am now, always have been, and always will be the friend of Cuba. The RECORD will show that ever since I have been a Member of this House I have done all in my power for the Cuban people. I am glad the Cuban Republic has taken her place among the nations of the earth. May success, happiness, prosperity, and domestic tranquility abide with her forever.

The time is at hand, nevertheless, when we must live up to our sacred obligations to Cuba. We granted her the freedom and the independence promised. We have launched this young Republic upon the ocean of nations, and said to all the world, Cuba is free and independent. We must say to every nation she is our creation—a daughter of the great Republic—and any interference with her will be an act unfriendly to the United States.

But that is not all. We must grant her immediate trade relief. In a commercial way she is at our mercy. This is not her fault—it is our fault. Congress has made it practically impossible for Cuba to market her products in other countries; they must be sold here, and they can not be sold in this country at present except at a loss, unless our tariff law is repealed or modified. This must be done at once—it should have been done months ago. The situation is serious and admits no further delay. The people want Congress to act, and our honor demands the immediate enact-

ment of a liberal reciprocity law. We must keep our word—our faith is pledged.

The Republican party is responsible for this deplorable commercial condition. The Republican party, wedded to its high protective-tariff policy, would rather see the commercial destruction of Cuba than consent to reduce its present system of outrageous high-tariff taxes.

When the Congress adopted the so-called Platt amendment, which I am glad I voted against, and which, in my judgment, never should have been adopted, it took an unfair advantage of Cuba; but when the amendment finally became a law the Cubans accepted it in good faith, and at our request wrote it into their constitution. By virtue of that amendment Cuba is commercially at our mercy to-day and unable to make treaties of a commercial character with other nations. Under the circumstances it seems to me that it is now incumbent on this Government to grant trade relief to Cuba, so that her products can be admitted into this country and sold without a loss.

So, sir, I shall vote for this bill because I am in favor of doing something now for Cuba. I want to see Cuba prosperous. I will vote for any measure to reduce the present tariff duties between this country and Cuba. In my judgment we should have free trade with Cuba. It would be beneficial to us and advantageous to the Cubans. It would help the people of both countries, commercially, financially, and politically. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The friends of the letter carriers' bill will never cease their efforts until it is written on the statute books of our country.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1904.

WASHINGTON.

1904.

S P E E C H
OF
H O N . W M . S U L Z E R .

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13521) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I move to strike out the paragraph under consideration and substitute the following, which I ask the Clerk to report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the paragraph under consideration, and offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Free-delivery service: For pay of letter carriers in offices already established, and for substitute letter carriers, and for temporary carriers at summer resorts, holiday, election, and emergency service, \$23,250,000. *Provided, however, That the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized in his discretion on and after June 30, 1904, to pay letter carriers in cities of more than 75,000 population for the first year of service, \$800; for the second year of service, \$800; for the third year of service, \$1,000; for the fourth year of service and thereafter \$1,200; and after June 30, 1904, to pay letter carriers in cities of a population of under 75,000 for the first year of service, \$600; for the second year of service, \$800; for the third year of service and thereafter, \$1,000.*

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, against that I make the point of order for the same reason. It is identically the same provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. On that, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion I do not think the point of order made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] is well taken with regard to this provision. The substitute just offered by myself is not in derogation of existing law and does not in any way change the law or place any limitation upon existing law. It simply gives the Postmaster-General a discretionary power to increase the pay of letter carriers. It is not mandatory in any sense, and hence it does not violate the rule.

It provides that this money is appropriated for the pay of letter carriers, and leaves it in the discretion of the Postmaster-General whether he wants to increase their pay or not. I do not think it comes within the rule of the House, and, in my judgment, I do not think the point of order made by the gentleman from Indiana is well taken, and I trust, in the interest of fair play and simple justice, the point of order will be overruled. Let us be fair; let

us be honest; let us be just; and, finally, let us pay the efficient, hard-working letter carriers decent wages, so that they can live like honest, hard-working, respectable American citizens. That is all I want to say now, so far as this point of order is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair understands that the salaries of letter carriers are now provided by law. The amendments offered by the gentleman from California were in the form of limitations; the present amendment alters the existing law by vesting in the Postmaster-General the discretion to pay increased salaries. No question as to a limitation arises. It is a positive enactment, changing the existing law prescribing the salaries and vesting in the Postmaster-General the discretion to increase them. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move now to strike out the last word, in order to get recognition to say what I want to say for the letter carriers of our country. I am now, always have been, and always will be their friend. For many years the letter carriers have been endeavoring to get fair, just, honest, decent pay from the Government of the United States. The people of this country, who are really the Government, are in favor, in my opinion, of paying the letter carriers a just day's pay for an honest day's work. That is all that is asked for. These letter carriers are the hardest worked, the most honest, the most efficient, the most competent, and the most obliging, courteous, and industrious employees of the Government; and they are the poorest paid. Do not forget that. It is a shame the way these men are compelled to work for a mere pittance, not enough to keep body and soul together. It is a disgrace to this great and wealthy Republic. They can not afford to bring their children up as children should be reared, and properly fed, and decently clothed, and sent to school, so that they will make honest men and good women and become fearless and patriotic citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I have received thousands and thousands of petitions from people all over this country which read as follows:

Mr. WILLIAM SULZER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I believe that the letter carriers are entitled to the increase of pay that they so earnestly desire. Their faithfulness, integrity, and energy in transacting the business of the people should certainly be recognized and rewarded, considering the fact that they are ill paid now. They suffer much from exposure, are docked when they miss a day's work, and there are no pensions for them.

OTTO BORY,
100 St. Marks Place, New York City.

Now, sir, I want to state that in every Congress since I have been here a bill has been introduced for the relief of the letter carriers. In five different Congresses—namely, the Fifty-fourth, the Fifty-fifth, the Fifty-sixth, the Fifty-seventh, and the Fifty-eighth—I had the honor of introducing such a bill myself, and I worked as hard as I could—before the committee, with Members of the House, in season and out of season—continually to get a favorable report, but all in vain. I never could get the Republicans on the committee to report the bill and do justice to the deserving letter carriers of the country. Time and time again on the floor of this House I have pleaded for just pay and decent treatment for these faithful employees.

Let me say to the Members of this House that on the 10th day of last November I reintroduced the letter carriers' bill, which reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 835) to increase the pay of letter carriers.

Be it enacted, etc., That after June 30, 1904, the pay of letter carriers in cities of more than 75,000 population for the first year of service shall be \$800; for the second year of service shall be \$800; for the third year of service shall be \$1,000; for the fourth year of service and thereafter shall be \$1,200. And after June 30, 1904, the pay of letter carriers in cities of a population of under 75,000 for the first year of service shall be \$600; for the second year of service, \$800; for the third year of service and thereafter, \$1,000.

SEC. 2. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

If there ever was a bill introduced in this House that ought to appeal to every Member as a matter of right and justice, it is this letter carriers' bill. The bill was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. It is there now. It is sleeping in that committee, and it will never wake up, never come out. That is all there is to it—a most commendable bill. Why should it not be reported? Why should it be smothered in the committee? Why should it not be presented to the House and the Members given an opportunity to vote for it or against it? We want a record on this bill. We want to fix responsibility, and the Republicans in this House are responsible and can not evade that responsibility.

The letter carriers' bill, now peacefully and silently slumbering in committee, has the support of over 1,450 petitions, covering nearly 2,000,000 names. One petition from New York City has on it 327,000 names. Resolutions from over 2,100 organizations, representing labor unions, boards of trade, business men's leagues, independent organizations, and fraternal associations, indorsed it. These came from all parts of the country. State legislatures, city councils, and in fact every organization of any kind, political, religious, and economic, have asked that this bill be passed, but still it sleeps. Not only that, but over 400 newspapers, daily and weekly, have supported the bill editorially. The demand that Congress take action on this bill has become general, but nothing is done. Why not? Ask the Republican members of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. Chairman, let me say again, I am a friend of the letter carriers. The Government in all its service has no more honest, no more tireless, no more faithful employees. These men are the most efficient, the hardest worked in all the country's service, and the poorest paid. The letter carriers of the land are compelled to toil day in and day out, in sunshine and in storm, in winter and in summer, in all kinds of weather, sometimes eighteen hours out of the twenty-four; and taking all other employees in the various Departments of the Federal Government as a basis for comparison, it can not be denied that the letter carriers render the most and the hardest work for the smallest remuneration.

Now, sir, why is it when every Democrat, I believe, on this side of the House is anxious for a favorable report on this bill, is anxious to have it passed, is anxious to vote for it to make it a law, why is it, I ask, that the Republicans in this House smother the bill every session in the committee? Why is the Republican party against the letter carriers' bill? Is it because a few Republican leaders of this House are opposed to giving the letter carriers decent wages? Or is it because the Republicans are so busy

legislating for monopoly that they have no time to legislate for man? And to think of it! The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], has the brazen audacity to rise in his place in this House and assert that this great Government can not afford to pay the letter carriers and postal employees decent wages! And in the face of the fact that we have in the Treasury a surplus of over \$224,000,000, the largest surplus in all our history, and every dollar taken from the pockets of the taxpayers.

There is a general sentiment, an urgent demand, from all over this country in favor of this bill to increase the pay of the letter carriers so that they shall be able to live decently. I have made a great many speeches in this House in favor of the letter carriers. After the action of the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices to-day I am of the opinion, and I want the letter carriers of the country to understand it, that they will never get their wages increased so long as the Republican party is in power in this House and can stop it. [Applause.]

Now, sir, I want to read an editorial from the New York American, one of the greatest newspapers in this country, owned, published, and edited by my distinguished colleague, WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, which expresses my views and ideas upon this question better than any words of mine. The editorial was published on Wednesday, March 23, 1904, and is as follows:

THE LETTER CARRIER THE POOREST PAID MAN IN THE UNITED STATES—
LET HIM HAVE DECENT WAGES FOR WORK THAT IS HARD AND EXPOSES
HIM TO CONSTANT DANGER OF SICKNESS.

In keeping with their attitude toward those who earn their bread in the sweat of their face, the Republicans in the lower House of Congress yesterday, by the brutal force of a majority, rejected a plea for additional pay to the letter carriers of the United States.

Representative LIVERNASH moved for an increase in the general appropriation bill in order that the letter carriers could be more decently paid.

The motion was rejected, and rejected by the Republican majority.

The demand for increased pay to the letter carriers is just. It is not a favor to these public servants. Increased pay is their right. They are the poorest paid men of all the thousands working for the United States.

Their scale of wages was fixed in 1878. They are paid at beginning \$600 a year. Then, after several years, they are paid \$800 a year, and if they live long enough, escaping the dangers of pneumonia and other disease incident to the exposure they undergo, they get \$1,000 a year.

But the letter carrier must work every day. He is docked for a day's absence. If he is sick he must lose his wages. When he gets old he draws no pension.

There is no reward for long or faithful service on the part of the letter carrier. If he would better his condition he must seek employment in another line of work.

A scale of wages made in 1878 may have been fair then, but such a scale is manifestly small now. The cost of food, of clothing, and all things incident to human life has increased since 1878, but the letter carrier is asked to work now for wages fixed under conditions that obtained over twenty years ago.

The United States Government should be liberal in payment of wages. The Government should give an example of fair dealing to the private employer.

In the case of the letter carrier the Government affords an example of stinginess that would do credit to a miser.

But the Government is not a living thing. It is what the majority in Congress makes it. That majority in Congress is Republican. The Republicans are asked to make it so that honest toilers can get decent wages, and they refuse.

This is more than a party question. It is a matter of humanity. Thousands of men in responsible positions in cities all over the United States, undergoing hardships that will wreck the constitution of any human being, are asking for enough money to live decently, to educate their children and give them something to live on when they are old. They can not in person make

the demands. Their case is in Congress, and yet the majority in Congress rejects an effort made in their behalf.

Write to your Member of Congress and ask him to vote for the bill to give letter carriers better pay. They are honest men. They work hard. They are held to the observance of the strictest rules, and they are more poorly paid than any other class of workingmen in the United States, considering the character of their duties.

Demand that the Republican majority, for once in its career, cease its opposition to decent treatment for men who labor for a living.

Let it be made so that the United States will always be a generous employer of labor and a fair paymaster.

[Applause.]

That editorial tells the truth. Written by a sincere friend of the wage-earners, it tells the truth in trumpet tones. It expresses my sentiments, and you must answer it. This matter can not be longer ignored. It can not be whistled down the wind. It is here to stay until justice is done. You must meet it, and sooner or later you will be forced to go on record and vote for it or against it, because the friends of the letter carriers' bill will never cease their efforts until it is written on the statute books of our country.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ALASKA.

The Alaskans are Americans, and they demand the inalienable right of Americans—the right to govern themselves, local self-government, home rule, no taxation without representation; and these can only be secured through Territorial government.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 1904.

WASHINGTON.

1904.

S P E E C H
OF
H O N . W M . S U L Z E R .

The House having under consideration the conference report on the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this appropriation of \$250,000 to build a military road from Valdez to Eagle City, in the district of Alaska. It will be money well spent to open up one of the richest countries in the world. I am surprised at the lack of information regarding Alaska displayed in this debate. The great trouble about this matter and all other matters concerning Alaska is the fact that very few Members here know anything about the requirements of that vast expanse of country we call Alaska. Every Member of Congress should visit Alaska, and if he did he would be in favor of giving the people there Territorial government. That is what is needed more than anything else at the present time by the people in the district of Alaska. If the Members of this House could realize the necessity for this and other legislation for Alaska, if they could get some adequate idea of the great mineral wealth that is hidden in Alaska, and which can be brought forth, and poured into the Treasury of the United States by the brain and the brawn of American citizens, they would be in favor of building this road to aid our people to get into the heart of southwestern Alaska.

This road is not a new project, born in a night. It has been surveyed by the military authorities of the United States, and for several years has been a military trail, traveled by thousands and thousands of people.

A report has been made on it to the Government, and that report is a public document. The object of this appropriation is to make the trail a wagon road to facilitate travel and business.

This road, going from Valdez to Eagle City, from south to north, will open up a vast country of over 100,000 square miles in Alaska richer than any other section of equal area in the Union. It will be money well spent to build this road, far-seeing economy, good statesmanship; and for every dollar the Government puts in there it will get back in a few years a thousand or ten thousand dollars. This road will make for progress, humanity, and advancement in Alaska. I know whereof I speak, because I have been there and know something about that vast and wonderful country. I desire to say that the reports of the Government show, first, that it is a fair agricultural country; second, that it is a good cattle country, and third, that it is exceedingly rich in minerals—in copper and gold, in silver and coal, and in iron and oil.

Mr. MADDOX. The gentleman has been up there, and is acquainted with that country. Can he tell us how we can stake out some of those claims?

Mr. SULZER. The law provides for that. [Laughter.] The gentleman has the same right under the law as any other citizen.

Mr. MADDOX. Where is that rich country the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. SULZER. All through southwestern and southeastern Alaska.

Mr. MADDOX. Does a road run through that?

Mr. SULZER. No; but this appropriation is necessary to build the road. There is a trail there now, and a very poor trail at that. In order to get into this country to-day it is necessary to follow this trail or go by way of the Klondike. At the present time the Federal judges, the United States marshal, and all the soldiers and military supplies go from Sitka and Juneau up to Skagway; from Skagway by the Yukon and White Pass Railway across the Chilcoot Pass, then through the Klondike country to Dawson, in British Columbia, then down the Yukon River to Eagle City, and then from Eagle City south along the headwaters of the Tanana to various places in southwestern Alaska.

The Government contemplated some time ago building a military road from Valdez to the Yukon River, all in the district of Alaska, a distance of about 250 miles. The weather in this sec-

tion of Alaska is never very cold, and much of the land is fertile and tillable. The reports of the Agricultural Department clearly prove all this and that the country is capable of sustaining a goodly population. It is a splendid cattle country and, as I have said, the richest in mineral wealth in the world. But aside from all this, I claim this road should be built as a military necessity. There are many Indians in there, and they have never come in contact with white people. Trouble may happen at any time. Our citizens are developing the country. They have staked out claims and are working them, and they should have the protection of the Government. If any trouble should ever happen up there, it would be impossible to get troops into the country under present conditions except through British territory. I am opposed to that. As a military necessity and for strategic reasons I am in favor of building this road, and I would not delay a day. [Applause.]

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this Government road from Valdez to the Yukon, and I know it will command a large amount of freight now going by other routes and greatly stimulate the settlement and development of a vast country. Branch lines will later be constructed to accommodate the business resulting from the discovery of copper and gold in this highly mineralized section. Discoveries of coal recently made at several points will expedite the work of opening up this region. What discoveries will be made the coming season no one can foretell, but it is my belief that a railway constructed immediately over the route as indicated would have a paying business as soon as it could be opened for travel and freight. Thousands of miles of profitable railway have been built in the United States in less promising regions.

It is of considerable value to this country in having this main route for transportation within its own territory, and, consequently, jurisdiction. Some of the many complications which have arisen in the Canadian Northwest Territory will be eliminated and Alaska developed without the hindrance or consent of a foreign country. This deserves our patriotic consideration. Our prospectors will have an opportunity of getting into the region at the head of the Tanana River and its eastern tributaries,

and on soil belonging to the United States. With a competing route to Dawson, that country would be greatly benefited, and it would aid in the settlement of pending questions with the Canadian government.

The advantages which would accrue to the vast territory which would be opened by a system of wagon roads and trails can not be overestimated. The development of its mineral resources, whether of gold or copper, requires the use of heavy modern machinery, which it is impossible to bring in under present conditions; but with the introduction of such machinery and the use of numberless streams of water which now run to waste vast enterprises would be established, immigration would be induced, and a permanent population wedded to the soil might result.

An additional reason why the road should be built is the increased and more economical postal facilities it will make possible. That this is vastly important will be conceded when it is remembered that the people of the interior sit in darkness, so to speak, for eight months in the year without the receipt of a newspaper, magazine, or book to put them in touch with the outside world.

Mr. James Fish, who holds the contract for transporting mails over this route, testifies that it now costs the Government \$44,000 per annum for a bimonthly mail service between Valdez and Eagle between May 1 and November 30, and a weekly service from December 1 to April 30. The compensation received for carrying these mails is all the advantage that can be derived from the contract. That with a wagon road established traffic would open up between all American towns and mining camps in the Forty-Mile district, the Yukon, and the Tanana, and very soon a daily stage line between Valdez and Eagle would be a profitable undertaking, and the mail contract would become a matter of less importance. It is also his opinion that, with the wagon road built, the Department would find no difficulty in letting the mail contract at a sum not to exceed \$15,000 per annum, thus effecting an annual saving over present prices of \$29,000.

We should take a broad view of this matter. We should stretch out an aiding hand to Alaska. She needs it now, and the Government owes her much. Let us be just and patriotic to our own

people in Alaska. We do not hesitate to appropriate \$250,000 to build a fort in some out-of-the-way place. We do not stop a moment to appropriate a million to build a gunboat. We are spending millions and millions of dollars in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. We do not hesitate to appropriate millions and millions of dollars for battle ships that in a few years will be useless; but when it comes to appropriating a few dollars to help the brave men of this country—our pioneers—who blaze the way of civilization into the virgin fields and primeval forests of a new empire, where wealth abounds beyond the dreams of avarice, some one like the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] gets up and protests. He wants more information, forsooth. But I say let us do something for Alaska now. The men who know most about Alaska favor this appropriation, and we should not wait until the ignorant are educated.

Let us pass it, and we can rely on the War Department to see to it that the money is well spent, and the Government in time will get it all back a thousand times over and more. Just think of it—there came out of this Tanana and Copper River country last year, in gold and silver and copper carried on the backs of horses and men, five millions of wealth. Build this road so that horses and wagons can go back and forth throughout this rich district, and I undertake to say the first year the road is open there will be brought forth more wealth than ever came out of the Klondike.

The Government receives a large revenue in taxes every year from Alaska, but it does very little for Alaska in return, and, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] has so well said, we refuse to give the cities in Alaska local municipal government; we even refuse to give the people of the district of Alaska Territorial government. It is a shame the way the Alaskans are treated by the Federal Government. We appropriate a paltry pittance every year for a United States marshal and the United States judges, and that is about all. The Government reports will show that we derive every year a net revenue from Alaska of over \$500,000. That money properly expended by the people in Alaska would open up and develop this vast country; that money would build these roads; that money would give employment to thousands and

thousands of honest, manly, patriotic American citizens who are now in Alaska and going there every year to better their condition; that money should be spent by Alaskans for Alaska, and the only way this can be accomplished is through the agency of Territorial government.

This is the great boon the people of Alaska desire from the Congress of the United States, and until it is granted all other matters are secondary. The Alaskans are Americans, and they demand the inalienable right of Americans, the right to govern themselves, local self-government; home rule, no taxation without representation; and these can only be secured through Territorial government. [Applause.]

"Democracy will live because it has a mission—a mission that can never die—the true mission of Democracy—to make all the world free and all mankind brothers."

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, April 27, 1904.



WASHINGTON.
1904.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House having under consideration the report of the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Military Academy appropriation bill—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: As one of the conferees on the part of the House I desire to say that I concur substantially in all that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] has said regarding the matters in dispute between the two Houses on the Military Academy appropriation bill. The conferees on the part of the House and the Senate have carefully considered all matters in conference, and we have agreed unanimously on this report. I hope therefore the report will be adopted by the House.

THE MILITARY ACADEMY CENTENNIAL PROCEEDINGS.

In regard to the criticisms made concerning the publication of the centennial ceremonies of the Academy, I wish to say that, in my opinion, the records should be preserved, and the only way that they can be preserved is by the publication of this volume of the proceedings. That centennial celebration was a matter of much historical value to all the people, and the proceedings should be published and distributed throughout the country in the way now provided in the bill. I believe the people are interested in the history of the West Point Military Academy, and will not find fault with Congress for appropriating this small amount of money for the publication in book form of the ceremonies attending the celebration of its centennial. This provision is recommended also by the War Department, and, in my judgment, it ought to be agreed to. These proceedings, when published in book form, are to be distributed as follows: Two thousand copies by the Members of the House, 1,000 copies by the members of the Senate, and the rest of the volumes by the Superintendent of the Academy under the direction of the Secretary of War. Many of us, I know, are now receiving requests from our constituents for these books. We can not get them and comply with the wishes of our constituents except the books are published, and they can only be published by the Government in this way. I trust the House will sustain the report of its conferees and secure the publication of this interesting and instructive book.

GIVE THE POOR MAN'S SON AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY.

Now, another thing, Mr. Speaker. Complaint has been made by some of the members of the small increase of allowances that the cadets at the Academy are to receive. In my opinion, we do not give the cadets at the Academy sufficient allowance. It would be well to give them more. At present these cadets do not receive enough in allowances to make both ends meet. It is a great hardship and disadvantage to the poor man's son. The expenses of the cadets at the Academy are considerable, and in many cases it is a great handicap to the poor boy. This is wrong, in my opinion, and I am willing to remedy it in so far as I can. The rich man's son can afford to buy all the necessary things that a cadet must have at the Academy. The poor man's son often can not afford

to make these necessary purchases, and it is for the purpose of more equitably equalizing matters that we concluded to grant this small increase in allowance. It is only fair and just and proper. The students at West Point should all be on an equal footing; there should be no discrimination between a poor man's son and a rich man's son—between the son of a farmer and the son of a general in the Army—they should all be treated alike, all on the same plane of absolute equality. This provision will help to do that and I am in favor of it. That is all I care to say at this time in regard to this conference report.

THE FIFTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS.

Mr. Speaker, this session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, we are informed, will adjourn to-morrow. Its record is now made and can not be changed. On that record the Republican party will go to the country, and in the coming election the people of the land will scrutinize what has been done and what has not been done and pass judgment. We have been in session since last November, and, all things considered, very little has been accomplished for the people.

FAILED TO MEET THE EXPECTATIONS OF THE PEOPLE.

This Republican Congress has failed to meet the just expectations of the people. It has refused to respond to their earnest demands. It has sneered at their sincere appeals and scorned their patriotic petitions. In its results it has been a Congress for the few and against the many. It has been easy to pass a corporation bill, but difficult to enact a law for the benefit of the plain people. It has been a most extravagant session in the reckless appropriations of the people's money for purposes of little value and of no lasting benefit.

The appropriations thus far made by the Fifty-eighth Congress since it convened in last November aggregate \$781,574,629, and before it finally adjourns on the 4th day of next March it gives every prospect of being a two-billion-dollar Congress—the most extravagant by far of any Congress in the history of the Government. Appropriations for needless purposes have run riot. Over 20,000 bills have been offered by members, of which about 1,200 have been passed, and of these less than 150 are of any public benefit. When it is said that all that this Congress has done during the past six months it has been in session is the enactment of Cuban reciprocity and the adjustment of the Panama Canal, it seems indeed trivial in comparison with what the Congress has failed to do—what it has left undone.

It has "stood pat" on high protective taxation and failed to revise the exorbitant tariff taxes; it has neglected to carry out the true reciprocity programme promised by President McKinley; it has refused to investigate the Post-Office corruption and the Indian Land Office scandals; it has refused to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to prevent discriminating railroad rates; it has failed to take any action against the criminal trusts; it has declined to pass the law to elect Senators in Congress by a direct vote of the people; it has refused all legislation in the interests of the toilers of the land. It has neglected to report the "eight-hour bill," the bill to establish a Department of Labor with a Secretary having a seat in the Cabinet, the "anti-injunction bill," the letter carriers' bill, the bill against the sale of convict-made goods—all demanded by organized labor. It has spurned every effort to enact measures for true home rule and better local self-government for the

Philippines, for Guam, for Hawaii, for Porto Rico, and for Alaska; it has refused to do anything to aid the American merchant marine; it has neglected to carry out Republican promises regarding statehood for the Territories; and, take it all in all, it has spent more money and given the people less to show for it than any other session of Congress in all the history of our existence, even in war times.

The expenses of the last four years of Republican Administration are over \$560,000,000 more than the expenses of the last four years of Democratic Administration, and nothing to show for it. Quite an item—quite a difference! The Democrats therefore have every reason to feel confident that the people will indignantly condemn the reckless extravagance of the Republicans, and with that end in view the Democrats invite a comparison of the expenses of this Republican Congress with any prior Democratic Congress. On the record the Republicans have thus far made in the Fifty-eighth Congress the Democrats appeal to the people, confident that they will condemn Republican profligacy and sustain Democratic economy by electing in the coming campaign a Democratic President and a Democratic House of Representatives pledged to retrenchment and reform and opposed to every scheme to take from the many for the benefit of the few.

DEMOCRATIC PROSPECTS IN THE COMING CAMPAIGN.

And now, Mr. Speaker, a few words about Democratic prospects in the coming campaign. We are entering the Presidential contest of 1904, and every indication is auspicious for Democratic success. In my opinion, and I say so advisedly, the Democratic party, if it is true to itself and to its fundamental principles, is destined to win in the coming battle. The stars in their courses this year will fight for Democracy. The record is against the Republican party—the people are with Democracy—and all we have to do from now on is to act wisely, exercise conservatism, use ordinary political sagacity, adopt an up-to-date platform, nominate a loyal, well-known, consistent, and popular candidate for President, and the Democratic party will sweep the country. Every Democrat in the land has his face to the rising sun and is marching on full of hope. The Republican administration of national affairs during the past few years supplies us with all the ammunition we want, and if we will present the facts of Republican inconsistency and broken promises earnestly and fearlessly to the American electorate, I feel confident our cause will be sustained. Every sincere Democrat in the land is confident of success, and all the signs of the times point unmistakably to Democratic victory in the battle of the ballots next fall.

WHAT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY STANDS FOR.

The Republican party stands to-day for high-tariff taxation, for economic policies and for subsidies that rob the many for the benefit of the few, for financial heresies that centralize wealth and paralyze industrial freedom, for political usurpations that subvert the Constitution, enslave the masses, trample under foot the rights of man, and laugh to scorn the immortal principles of the Declaration of Independence.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IS DISINTEGRATING.

The Republican party is not what it used to be. It no longer has a message for humanity; it no longer stands for great principles; it no longer has a conscience; it no longer stands for the policies of its founders, and it has not a single honest issue to-day

it dares present to the country. The fingers of greed and graft have erased every motto from its banners; its army of supporters is disheartened and split in factions; it is going to pieces from the bitterness engendered by the jealousies of its own leaders; it is rotting away with the cancer of corruption; it is disintegrating, and it all portends, in the near future, overwhelming Republican defeat and triumphant Democratic victory.

NEW YORK STATE WILL SURELY GO DEMOCRATIC.

Let me say to you gentlemen on the other side that New York State will surely go Democratic in the coming election. It is the pivotal State of the Union, and its place again in the Democratic column means the election of a Democratic President. There is no doubt about New York. The Empire State is safe for Democracy. The Republican party there is hopelessly divided, and sane Republicans now admit that the State is lost to their party beyond recovery. It is a political axiom that without New York State the Republicans can not win, and this means a Democratic House of Representatives and a Democratic President and the beginning of the end of Republican misrule, Republican corruption, and Republican maladministration.

WHAT WILL BE THE ISSUE?

This is not the time nor the place, Mr. Speaker, to discuss what will be the leading issue in the coming campaign. Politicians do not make issues; events and the people make them; but if you want to know about some of the questions that will be discussed from now until the polls close next fall I have only to ask you to consider what is going on and what has been going on in our national affairs for the past three years. We read daily about rascality in high places. Take off the lid and you will find that nearly every Department of the Government in Washington is honeycombed with corruption. The dirty fingers of Republican officeholders are looting the Treasury, and the soiled hands of Republican corruptionists are pillaging the very temple of humanity.

The people know something about the frauds in the Post-Office Department, frauds which constituted a stench in the nostrils of every honest American; something about the profits in the army contracts; something about the rottenness in the Interior Department, by which our public lands have been despoiled and the poor Indians systematically robbed; something about the "rake off" in the armor-plate deals of the Navy Department; something about the sleeping Department of Justice that awakens occasionally to plead the "statute of limitations" for Republican criminals who have betrayed their trust and filled their pockets with the people's money; something about oppressive tariff taxation, that robs the many for the benefit of the few, shelters monopoly, sells American products cheaper abroad than at home, and gives free rein to the criminal trusts to plunder the consumers and producers of our country. These scandals are notorious, and the half has not been told. Republican newspapers are getting tired of apologizing for Republican crookedness, and the special pleaders of the "grand old party" from one end of the land to the other weary of keeping Republican "grafters" out of jail.

Mr. Speaker, I say the people know something about official rascality and corruption and speculation in Washington, but they have only an inkling as to the real facts. They want to know more; they want to know all. It is said that the Republican party is always lenient to its criminals, that it shelters Republican offenders, covers up their rascalities, and takes long chances

to prevent their successful prosecution. But the time is at hand when the people demand that justice be administered to these public thieves, regardless of their social standing or political affiliation. We are getting at the truth gradually, but we do not know how great these peculations may be or how far-reaching corruption extends in high places and different branches of the Government. We can not find out all the facts. The Republicans are entrenched in power at the Capitol, and they refuse to grant our demands for legislative investigations.

The Democrats are thwarted at every turn. We introduce resolutions of inquiry only to have the resolutions smothered in committees by Republican majorities; we demand impartial investigations and our demands are met with sneers. The Republican party has been in power too long; there should be a change. The people want a chance to get at the books, to get at the truth, and the whole truth, and they know the only way to accomplish this is to elect in the coming campaign a Democratic President and a Democratic House of Representatives. Then these investigations will proceed with all diligence, and corruption wherever it exists laid bare. And so, sir, if I mistake not, one of the principle issues in the coming campaign will be "Turn the Republicans out and send the corruptionists to the penitentiary."

A SAD COMPARISON.

For several years past, Mr. Speaker, the Republican spellbinders have shouted "stand pat" and for the "full dinner pail." The Republican party has "stood pat," but to-day the dinner pail of the wage-earner is empty and a million honest, industrious, hard-working men are tramping the country looking for work. During the past six months there has been a shrinkage of values in the country of over \$10,000,000,000—more than one-eighth of our entire wealth. The figures are appalling, but they are frightfully true and accurate. Hard times, financial panics, bankruptcies, labor lockouts, strikes, reduction in wages, and industrial disasters seem to be the order of the day, and disaster must follow disaster just so long as the "stand-pat" order is tolerated and Republican policies that rob the many for the benefit of the few sustained.

I say it is a crying evil that protected American products are sold cheaper abroad than at home, and the farmers and wage-earners of our country compelled to pay exorbitant prices for the necessities of life in order that a few may be enriched at the expense of the many. According to a recent report of the Government, wages have been reduced in certain industries more than 20 per cent in the past eighteen months, and the cost of living all along the line has increased more than 16 per cent. Here is a reduction of at least 36 per cent in the earning capacity and purchasing power of the breadwinner; and in view of it all the "full dinner pail" becomes a hollow mockery, "stand pat" a sham, and "Republican prosperity" a delusion and a snare. The comparison is a sad commentary on existing industrial conditions, and demonstrates the falsity of Republican promises when contrasted with actual performances. "Words are good, and only so when backed up by deeds."

WHAT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY STANDS FOR AND ITS MISSION.

My friends, it is the high mission of Democracy to equitably reform these glaring Republican inequalities and bring about a fairer distribution of the fruits of toil. Labor produces all wealth, and in return the toiler merely gets a meager existence. We

legislate too much for the few, too little for the many. It is all wrong. It has got to be stopped, and it can only be stopped through the agency of the Democratic party. The grand old party of Jefferson is, and always will be, the hope of the toilers and the bulwark of the wage-earners and producers of the land. When our party comes into power it will readjust these Republican inequities in a spirit of fairness and equality, so that those best able to bear the burden of government shall at least sustain their just share, and luxuries as well as the necessities of life shall contribute to its support.

Have no fears; the Democratic party will do this. It stands to-day where it always has stood and where it always will stand—for equal rights to all, special privileges to none; for social order and good government; for retrenchment and reform; for home rule; for equal and exact justice to all men—no class legislation, no caste, no cant, no pretense, no hypocrisy, no sumptuary and oppressive laws; for the home and the schoolhouse; for free men; for a free and untrammelled press; for freedom of speech, freedom of action, and freedom of trade; for civil and religious liberty; for the rights of man; for the sanctity of the ballot box; for peace and harmony—the strength and support of all great institutions—between labor and capital; for a fair day's pay for an honest day's work; for a loyal acquiescence in the will of the majority; for the money of the Constitution—a nonfluctuating dollar—worth at all times 100 cents; for an equitable system of taxation adequate to defray the expenses of the Government honestly and economically administered, and so distributed that the rich as well as the poor shall pay their just share of the burden; for the election of Senators in Congress by a direct vote of the people; for a strict construction of the Constitution; for necessary internal improvements; for the upbuilding of our merchant marine; for the abolition of every criminal monopoly; for friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; for the Monroe doctrine; for sympathy with the oppressed of every land and in every clime; for the perpetuity of our free institutions, and for the sublime principles of the Declaration of Independence here and wherever our flag, Old Glory, greets the morning sun and floats in the free air of heaven.

These principles are now a part, have always been a part, and must ever continue to be a part of the affirmative platform of the Democratic party. Men may come and men may go, but these principles are undying and will go on forever.

I have no fears for Democracy. Its future is as secure as its past is glorious, and its ultimate success is written on the pages of destiny. It will live to voice the sentiments of liberty and to give breath to the freedom of the fathers; it will live to remedy every national evil and to correct every governmental abuse; it will live to push onward the forces of civilization, to lift humanity to a higher plane in the march of progress—to champion the cause that lacks assistance, to stem the tide that needs resistance, to battle for the weak against the strong, for the right against the wrong; it will live to stop the predatory few—under the cloak of law—from robbing the protesting many; it will live to commend the Constitution, to defend the Declaration of Independence, and to fight for the glory of the flag; it will live because it has a mission—a mission that can never die—the true mission of Democracy—to make all the world free and all mankind brothers.

IN FAVOR OF THE AMERICAN NAVY.



SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

FEBRUARY 20, 1905.



WASHINGTON.
1905.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. SULZER.

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am now, always have been, and always expect to be a friend of the American Navy. It is the strongest arm of our national defense in time of war, and the best guaranty of our lasting peace. It is national insurance, and every dollar spent for the Navy is economy in the long run.

To my surprise, the gentlemen who have spoken in this debate against these two battle ships alluded to the remote possibility that it may impede the bill appropriating money for the construction of public buildings. In my opinion, that idea or suggestion is unsound and untenable. What is the use of us appropriating money to construct public buildings in our large seacoast cities if we do not appropriate money to continue the construction of the navy to protect these buildings in case of war? Let me remind these gentlemen that in 1812 there were public buildings in the United States, but a foreign fleet came to our shores and many of these public buildings were destroyed and this very Capitol burned to the ground because the American people did not have a navy to protect its public buildings and repel foreign invasion. [Applause.]

As a friend of the American Navy, voicing, as I believe, the mature and deliberate judgment of my constituents and a great majority of the citizens of New York, I am in favor of the provision in this bill for the construction of two more battle ships. I do not believe there is an intelligent man in the country who has looked into this matter and has studied the true situation that would be opposed to the appropriation for these two new battle ships. I do not understand how a Representative from

New York City, or from any other great city on our Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific coasts can vote against these two battle ships or can oppose the judicious increase of the American Navy. We know how the people of New York and other seaport towns felt at the beginning of the Spanish-American war. I know what the feeling of the people of New York City was when a Spanish war vessel crossed the Atlantic and anchored in New York Bay just before war was declared against Spain.

There are no politics in the Navy or in continuing its efficiency. It is a nonpartisan question, and every true American, no matter what his opinion may be regarding the Army, is in favor of increasing our Navy until we have one of the strongest and one of the best navies in the world. To strike out of this bill one of these battle ships would be naval retrogression. It would be a step backwards in our naval policy. The American Navy is growing. I want to see it continue to grow until we have a navy second to none in the world. It will be money well spent in the end, and it will be economy in the right direction. The American people, in my judgment, do not want to stop the growth of their Navy. I believe the Members of this House by adhering to the provisions in this bill for two new battle ships will only meet the just expectations of their constituents. [Applause.]

The American people take a just pride in their Navy. They have every reason to be proud of it, to be proud of its past, to be proud of it now, and to be proud of its future. The Navy is one of America's greatest institutions—a bulwark of defense, a mighty engine of offense—and should be liberally supported by the Congress of the United States for all its wants by generous appropriations.

Every dollar spent on the Navy is just so much money expended for insurance. A better investment could not be made. We must all stand by and for the Navy.

The most unthinking individual in the country realizes how important it is for the Government to have a strong, a great, and a mighty navy. We have a larger and more vulnerable seaboard than any other country in the world. We will soon, I

believe, have a great merchant marine. We have great cities of immense wealth, of costly buildings, of commerce, and of property, the value of which is incalculable, all along our sea-coasts. They must and should be all protected, and they can not be better protected, better safeguarded than by a modern, a commensurate, a powerful, and an efficient navy. [Applause.]

I shall vote for these two additional battle ships. I have never voted to cripple the Navy and I hope I never shall. I am in favor of increasing the power, the strength, the tonnage, and the efficiency of the American Navy. I know how nervous the merchants in New York felt when a Spanish war vessel crossed the Atlantic and anchored in New York Bay just before war was declared against Spain. The people of my city are now, ever have been, and, in my judgment, ever will be, in favor of doing everything in their power to keep up the efficiency and continue the gradual increase of the Navy. The American Navy is growing. We ought to do nothing to stop that growth.

Mr. MADDUX rose.

Mr. SULZER. I regret, Mr. Chairman, I can not yield to the gentleman now; I have only five minutes. We ought to do nothing, I say, to stop that growth, and I hope that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Maddux] will, when the time comes, vote in favor of these two more battle ships. [Applause.]

We do not want to take a step backward. Our policy in naval matters should be progress—forward along well-defined and legitimate lines. The war now going on between Russia and Japan demonstrates the helplessness of a country whose navy is at the bottom of the sea. Have we so soon forgotten the lessons of the Spanish-American war? Have we forgotten what Dewey did at Manila and what Schley did at Santiago? [Applause.]

Mr. MADDUX. I say, hold on. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDUX. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SULZER. Well, I will yield to the gentleman for just one question.

Mr. MADDUX. I only want to ask the gentleman how many battle ships he is in favor of?

Mr. SULZER. Two now. That is what I said—that is what this naval bill says.

Mr. MADDUX. Go ahead, then; I am with you. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. I am glad to know the gentleman from Georgia is with me, and I trust all the Members on this side of the House will be with me. I do not understand, I can not comprehend, how any Member of this House, realizing our great coast line, our interests on the Atlantic and the Pacific, realizing the wealth of our cities situated upon our shores, can possibly object to the building of two more battle ships and oppose the continuance of an increase of the Navy by voting to strike out the provision in this bill for two more battle ships.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a few words in conclusion. I shall vote in favor of the construction of two more battle ships as provided in this bill, because we need a great navy to protect our commerce on the high seas and to vindicate American citizenship and all that it stands for in every port and in every land in the world. I believe in the Navy. I stand for the Navy, and while I am in Congress I will always do all that I can for the Navy—for the men on deck, for the men below, and for the men behind the guns. All honor and all glory to the American sailors, to the American Navy, and to their patriotic, their heroic, and their splendid achievements. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

*“Do something for our shipping interests, and do it
quickly, and stop talking.”*

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

February 22, 1905.

WASHINGTON.
1905.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 18809) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] interested me—in fact, everything the gentleman says interests me—especially that part of his speech in which he referred to the American merchant marine. I desire, however, to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman is the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine, and we look to him for legislation on this subject.

Just before the Congress adjourned at its last session it appointed a joint committee to investigate the cause of the decline of our merchant marine and to recommend to this session of Congress legislation to restore our former glory in over-sea carrying trade. I voted for the resolution to appoint that committee, and when I did so I indulged the hope that the bright day was not far distant when something more than empty words and hollow promises would be done for the shipping interests of the United States. But I am, forsooth, doomed to deep and bitter disappointment. Nothing has been done, and, take my word for it, nothing will be done—I was going to say that nothing was ever intended to be done; but let us proceed and see what the gentleman from Ohio and this committee did and have done. It would be ludicrous if it were not so tragical and humiliating.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] was a prominent member of that committee, and, knowing him as I do, I looked

for results. At last I thought that now something is going to be done in a businesslike way for our merchant marine. That committee met and organized, and held sessions during last summer and fall in all the large cities of the country. The committee called many witnesses and took a great deal of testimony, which testimony was filed at the beginning of this session with the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The gentleman from Ohio asked for an extension of time to make the report. It was granted until the first part of January. An extension of time, I say, was granted, and the gentleman made a very long and voluminous report, but you can not make head nor tail out of it. A Philadelphia lawyer can not tell what it means. The most luminous mind in the country can not comprehend what it recommends. And the bill that was reported with it is a trust bill—a subsidy bill—to rob the many for the benefit of the few. The whole thing is a farce, and nothing is to be done for our merchant marine. The time for final adjournment is at hand, and legislation for our merchant marine—to place the American flag again where it was before the civil war, on every sea and in every port—seems to be suspended, like Mohammed's coffin, somewhere between heaven and earth.

Now, sir, I think it is pretty well understood that I am a friend of the great shipping interests of the United States, and have done all in my power ever since I have been a Member of this House to aid in a practical way the immediate restoration of our merchant marine. I have introduced several bills in different Congresses, and have a bill now pending before the committee of which the gentleman from Ohio is chairman, that, if enacted in law, would solve the problem and give our own people our over-sea carrying trade. This bill of mine is in line with the promises of the Republican party's platform in favor of discriminating duties. The gentleman's bill is for subsidies. I am opposed to subsidies. I am opposed to robbing the many for the benefit of the few. I stand now, and have always stood, on this question just where President McKinley stood when he said:

We must encourage our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be manned by and owned by Americans. The policy of

discriminating duties in favor of our shipping which prevailed in the early years of our history should be again promptly adopted by Congress and vigorously supported until our prestige and supremacy on the seas are fully attained.

The gentleman from Ohio knows, or ought to know, that a subsidy bill can not pass this House. I know a bill along the lines of discriminating duties can. It is our old and true policy, and the only feasible remedy.

Mr. Chairman, it is a fact, and we all know it, that the United States in 1810, with 7,000,000 inhabitants, owned more registered tonnage for over-sea trade than the United States of 1904, with a population of 80,000,000. This tonnage in 1810 was 981,000; it is now 873,000, and, worse still, it showed an actual decrease of 6,000 tons from the year before. In 1810 American ships and American sailors carried 91.5 per cent of their country's ocean trade, and, moreover, a great share of that of Europe.

In 1861, though we had already lost our Atlantic steam lines and our shipbuilding was falling off, we still carried 65.2 per cent of our own trade and some of the trade of other nations; but American ships last year conveyed only 8.8 per cent of our imports and exports. Our registered tonnage in 1861 stood at 2,496,000. It stands now at 873,000. Two-thirds of our once great and powerful deep-sea fleet has vanished; and not one new keel for a deep-sea ship is being laid on either our Atlantic or Pacific coast line, and meanwhile an ever-increasing fleet of foreign vessels throngs our ports and monopolizes the carrying of more than nine-tenths of our import and export commerce.

The United States pays to these foreign vessels for conveying our freights and passengers upward of \$200,000,000 a year. Much of this vast sum of money goes to steamers which are regularly enrolled on the "merchant cruiser" list of European governments, which are manned by naval reserve officers and sailors, and are available for service against us in case of war.

The British Empire has 14,800,000 tons of merchant shipping; Germany, 2,960,000 tons; France, 1,480,000 tons; Norway, 1,660,000 tons; Italy, 1,180,000 tons. By far the larger part of all these fleets is engaged in ocean carrying, but the United

States of America, which produces far more merchandise and now sends more abroad than any other nation, has a fleet registered for deep-sea commerce of only 873,000 tons.

Mr. Chairman, that is the situation at present. Let me ask the gentleman from Ohio, who talks so glibly in favor of the American merchant marine, what has he done for the American merchant marine? He is charged with the responsibility. He is the chairman of the committee. He has a united and solid majority behind him. What has he done for this vast interest? This Congress has been in session ever since last December.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me to answer him?

Mr. SULZER. Not just now. I have only a few minutes, and I did not interrupt the gentleman's speech. [Laughter.] What has become of the gentleman's bill for the American merchant marine? He has a large majority on his side of the House; he is a member of the Committee on Rules and could have brought in a rule and the bill could have been considered long ago. The whole subject could have been debated, the bill amended and made into a good bill to really aid and help the American merchant marine.

Then we could have passed it, as we have so many other good bills, and finally sent it over to the Senate of the United States, that august tomb of all popular legislation. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, sir, I submit that if the gentleman from Ohio had done this much he would at least have done his duty; would at least have done something for his country; would at least have shown his good will for the American merchant marine; would at least, to some small degree, have shown his desire to keep the promises of his party on this great and important question. But instead of doing this—doing, I say, what he ought to have done—he gets up here at the eleventh hour of the session and talks about the tribulations of Russia and her defeats on land and sea being due to the fact that Japan has a great merchant marine to aid her navy, transport her troops, and carry her

commerce, and Russia has not. That may all be true, and if it is, it is an arraignment of the gentleman and his party for their indolence and failure to do what ought to have been done long ago for our merchant marine. Do something, I say to the gentleman from Ohio, for our shipping interests, and do it quickly and stop talking. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

IN FAVOR OF THE AMERICAN NAVY.



SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

FEBRUARY 20, 1905.



WASHINGTON.
1905.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. SULZER.

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am now, always have been, and always expect to be a friend of the American Navy. It is the strongest arm of our national defense in time of war, and the best guaranty of our lasting peace. It is national insurance, and every dollar spent for the Navy is economy in the long run.

To my surprise, the gentlemen who have spoken in this debate against these two battle ships alluded to the remote possibility that it may impede the bill appropriating money for the construction of public buildings. In my opinion, that idea or suggestion is unsound and untenable. What is the use of us appropriating money to construct public buildings in our large seacoast cities if we do not appropriate money to continue the construction of the navy to protect these buildings in case of war? Let me remind these gentlemen that in 1812 there were public buildings in the United States, but a foreign fleet came to our shores and many of these public buildings were destroyed and this very Capitol burned to the ground because the American people did not have a navy to protect its public buildings and repel foreign invasion. [Applause.]

As a friend of the American Navy, voicing, as I believe, the mature and deliberate judgment of my constituents and a great majority of the citizens of New York, I am in favor of the provision in this bill for the construction of two more battle ships. I do not believe there is an intelligent man in the country who has looked into this matter and has studied the true situation that would be opposed to the appropriation for these two new battle ships. I do not understand how a Representative from

New York City, or from any other great city on our Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific coasts can vote against these two battle ships or can oppose the judicious increase of the American Navy. We know how the people of New York and other seaport towns felt at the beginning of the Spanish-American war. I know what the feeling of the people of New York City was when a Spanish war vessel crossed the Atlantic and anchored in New York Bay just before war was declared against Spain.

There are no politics in the Navy or in continuing its efficiency. It is a nonpartisan question, and every true American, no matter what his opinion may be regarding the Army, is in favor of increasing our Navy until we have one of the strongest and one of the best navies in the world. To strike out of this bill one of these battle ships would be naval retrogression. It would be a step backwards in our naval policy. The American Navy is growing. I want to see it continue to grow until we have a navy second to none in the world. It will be money well spent in the end, and it will be economy in the right direction. The American people, in my judgment, do not want to stop the growth of their Navy. I believe the Members of this House by adhering to the provisions in this bill for two new battle ships will only meet the just expectations of their constituents. [Applause.]

The American people take a just pride in their Navy. They have every reason to be proud of it, to be proud of its past, to be proud of it now, and to be proud of its future. The Navy is one of America's greatest institutions—a bulwark of defense, a mighty engine of offense—and should be liberally supported by the Congress of the United States for all its wants by generous appropriations.

Every dollar spent on the Navy is just so much money expended for insurance. A better investment could not be made. We must all stand by and for the Navy.

The most unthinking individual in the country realizes how important it is for the Government to have a strong, a great, and a mighty navy. We have a larger and more vulnerable seaboard than any other country in the world. We will soon, I

believe, have a great merchant marine. We have great cities of immense wealth, of costly buildings, of commerce, and of property, the value of which is incalculable, all along our sea-coasts. They must and should be all protected, and they can not be better protected, better safeguarded than by a modern, a commensurate, a powerful, and an efficient navy. [Applause.]

I shall vote for these two additional battle ships. I have never voted to cripple the Navy and I hope I never shall. I am in favor of increasing the power, the strength, the tonnage, and the efficiency of the American Navy. I know how nervous the merchants in New York felt when a Spanish war vessel crossed the Atlantic and anchored in New York Bay just before war was declared against Spain. The people of my city are now, ever have been, and, in my judgment, ever will be, in favor of doing everything in their power to keep up the efficiency and continue the gradual increase of the Navy. The American Navy is growing. We ought to do nothing to stop that growth.

Mr. MADDON rose.

Mr. SULZER. I regret, Mr. Chairman, I can not yield to the gentleman now; I have only five minutes. We ought to do nothing, I say, to stop that growth, and I hope that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDON] will, when the time comes, vote in favor of these two more battle ships. [Applause.]

We do not want to take a step backward. Our policy in naval matters should be progress—forward along well-defined and legitimate lines. The war now going on between Russia and Japan demonstrates the helplessness of a country whose navy is at the bottom of the sea. Have we so soon forgotten the lessons of the Spanish-American war? Have we forgotten what Dewey did at Manila and what Schley did at Santiago? [Applause.]

Mr. MADDON. I say, hold on. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SULZER. Well, I will yield to the gentleman for just one question.

Mr. MADDOX. I only want to ask the gentleman how many battle ships he is in favor of?

Mr. SULZER. Two now. That is what I said—that is what this naval bill says.

Mr. MADDOX. Go ahead, then; I am with you. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. I am glad to know the gentleman from Georgia is with me, and I trust all the Members on this side of the House will be with me. I do not understand, I can not comprehend, how any Member of this House, realizing our great coast line, our interests on the Atlantic and the Pacific, realizing the wealth of our cities situated upon our shores, can possibly object to the building of two more battle ships and oppose the continuance of an increase of the Navy by voting to strike out the provision in this bill for two more battle ships.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a few words in conclusion. I shall vote in favor of the construction of two more battle ships as provided in this bill, because we need a great navy to protect our commerce on the high seas and to vindicate American citizenship and all that it stands for in every port and in every land in the world. I believe in the Navy. I stand for the Navy, and while I am in Congress I will always do all that I can for the Navy—for the men on deck, for the men below, and for the men behind the guns. All honor and all glory to the American sailors, to the American Navy, and to their patriotic, their heroic, and their splendid achievements. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK
AND THE CUSTOM-HOUSE
PROPERTY.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

February 24, 1905.

WASHINGTON.
1905.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. SULZER.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 18969) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes—

The Clerk read as follows :

New York, N. Y., rent of old custom-house : for rental of temporary quarters for the accommodation of certain Government officials, \$130,600.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read by the Clerk to pay the National City Bank of New York City \$130,600 for one year's rent for the old custom-house in the city of New York. I think most of the Members know something about this old, bewhiskered, long-standing, and continuing steal by the National City Bank of the city of New York. It is a great national scandal. The Members of this House, I take it, have not forgotten the fight I made last year against this steal, and for several years, ever since the scandal began, when a former Secretary of the Treasury, Lyman J. Gage, entered into a private contract, I think in 1897 or 1898, with the National City Bank to sell to it the old custom-house property, taking in an entire block in Wall street, for about one-half of the real value of the property. I think the purchase price agreed on was \$3,200,000, about one-half the true value of the property according to the opinion of competent real estate experts. The bank has on deposit upward of from fifteen to twenty million dollars all the time of the Government's money, for which it pays the Government no interest.

The bank paid the Government \$50,000 on account of the \$3,200,000 that they were to pay for this property, but the rest

of the money the bank has never paid to the Government, and the deed from the Government to the bank has never been delivered and recorded in the city of New York. The consequence is that for years the bank has held the Government's money, paid the Government no interest on it, and has loaned this money out to borrowers and made from 60 to 80 per cent profit a year on the money loaned—the people's money, too. Then the next thing the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, did was to agree that the Government would pay the bank a rental of \$130,600 a year for the old custom-house until the new custom-house is finished, and no one can tell how long that will be; and the Government has been paying the National City Bank this amount of money—\$130,600 a year—for rent ever since that transaction took place six or seven years ago. Mr. Gage was very good to this bank. Why? Well, we will see. Of course it was a secret, unconscionable contract. Of course the people were robbed, but that is the policy of the "system."

The result is that the Government has never received a dollar, still owns the property so far as the record shows, and is paying every year a rental of \$130,600 to the National City Bank. Shocking, is it not? And if it continues the bank will get back from the Government practically every dollar that the bank agreed to pay the Government for the property, and if it keeps on for a few years more the National City Bank will get this custom-house property, one of the most valuable blocks of property in the city of New York—some say it is now worth \$10,000,000—for absolutely nothing. And do not forget the bank has never parted with a dollar—kept the money in the bank all the time—just transferred it, if you please, from one account to another. Here is frenzied finance indeed.

Now, another thing I desire to call to the attention of the Members of this House in this connection, and that is that the failure of the Government to deed this property to the bank and the failure of the bank to record the deed in the register's office of the county of New York prevents the city of New York from taxing this property, because it still remains Government property—the title stands in the name of the Government.

The city of New York is therefore deprived of a large amount of tax every year, because the city or the State can not tax Government property. This is one of the greatest scandals in this country. It is a notorious fraud, and is a stench in the nostrils of honest men. It should be stopped now. We can do it by striking out of this bill this appropriation of \$130,600 for rent, which is a fraud on its face; and if we do we will compel the bank to pay the money it owes into the United States Treasury and record the deed, so that the property can be taxed by the people of New York City. Let us do this and end this disgraceful business. What is the influence behind the National City Bank? Who owns this bank? Every man in this House knows what that influence is and means. Every Member knows, or should know, that the National City Bank is the Standard Oil bank—the Rockefeller bank. That tells the story. That is why this damnable steal is a yearly continuing steal. Read Thomas W. Lawson's story of "Frenzied Finance" in Everybody's Magazine and you will know the sinister grafting influence, the tremendous political power that bank has had in governmental affairs in this country, to say nothing of its malignant influence in Wall street on the finances of the country.

If there is a Member here in doubt as to how he should vote on my motion, I suggest that he get and read the report made by Secretary Gage to this House in answer to a resolution introduced by me calling for the letters from the officers of the National City Bank to Secretary of the Treasury Gage, and the latter's answer thereto. Read those incriminating letters. The National City Bank wanted the people's money deposited in its bank—because, forsooth, it had made a large campaign contribution to the Republican party in 1896.

Mr. Gage got out of the Cabinet soon after these disclosures were made. Why? I believe he became president of a national bank in the city of New York. Who owns or controls this bank? Ask the National City Bank. The "system" always takes care of its own. But I want to be just and charitable, and I will not pursue this matter further. All I want to do now is to stop the steal—end the scandal. Let the bank pay the

Government what it owes. Let the deed be filed and recorded, and the bank will have to pay its share of the taxes of New York County.

I trust my motion will prevail. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, the statements made by the gentlemen have been made over and over in this House. The contract was made years ago. It is sufficient to say that it is a contract of the Government made under authority of law, and if we were to fail to appropriate in this bill for the rent the City National Bank could go into court and get its money in a judgment against the United States for rent.

Mr. SULZER. What court?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Oh, the gentleman will please—

Mr. SULZER. Oh, answer the question.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman will please keep quiet until I yield to him. I have not yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. SULZER. Well, answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has not yielded to a question.

Mr. SULZER. Oh, he can not answer the question. I thought he was a lawyer.

* * * * *

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What was the amount of money paid the City Bank for this building?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I forget, as it has been so long back.

Mr. BAKER. Over \$3,000,000.

Mr. SULZER. Three million two hundred thousand dollars; and this property, from the estimate of competent real estate dealers, is worth over \$6,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What did it sell for?

Mr. SULZER. Three million two hundred thousand dollars.

* * * * *

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FINLEY. How long will this contract continue?

Mr. HEMENWAY. This contract continues, I suppose, until the new custom-house is completed in New York. I am right on that, am I not?

Mr. FINLEY. This is a part of the contract?

Mr. HEMENWAY. That is a part of the contract.

Mr. SULZER. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] that as the work is now progressing on the new custom-house and as it has progressed for the past four or five years, it will take ten years more at least to build and finish it. By that time the bank will have received for rent from the Government more money than the bank actually agreed to pay for the old custom-house property.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am not familiar with the progress of the building over there, but we are to pay 4 per cent of the purchase price until the new custom-house is completed. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10 strike out lines 6 to 9, both inclusive.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SULZER) there were—ayes 74, noes 74.

Mr. SULZER. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken, and tellers were ordered. The Chairman appointed as tellers the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HEMENWAY, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. SULZER.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 90, noes 77.

So the amendment was agreed to.

EULOGY ON THE LATE
WILLIAM F. MAHONEY.

R E M A R K S

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

FEBRUARY 26, 1905.

WASHINGTON.

1905.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. SULZER.

Resolved, That in pursuance of the special order heretofore adopted the House proceed to pay tribute to the memory of Hon. WILLIAM F. MAHONEY, late a Member of this House from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a faithful and distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of the memorial proceedings of this day, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.
Resolved, That the Clerk do, and is hereby, instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: As a friend of WILLIAM F. MAHONEY, I come to-day to place on record my humble tribute to his memory. His unexpected death was a grievous blow to all his colleagues in this House, and a terrible shock to his family, his relatives, and his innumerable friends. It darkened a happy home, prostrated a loving family, and cast a pall of sadness over his native city. He died in the prime of life, at the summit of his career, in the zenith of his fame, in the service of his country, loved and mourned by all who knew him. But—

There is a reaper whose name is Death,
And with his sickle keen
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath,
And the flowers that grow between.

And our friend was a kindly, stately, knightly flower in the great garden of mankind.

WILLIAM F. MAHONEY was born in Chicago in 1856. He was a true son of the great metropolis of the West—that go-ahead, up-to-date, progressive, enterprising, and wonderful city on Lake Michigan. He was a product of Chicago, and he loved his native city with all the ardor of his nature, and always grew eloquent when discussing her greatness and her glories. He was educated in her schools, grew to manhood in her smiles and sunshine, became one of her leading merchants, served twelve years in her local legislature, and became one of her most prominent, popular, and distinguished citizens. He was proud of Chicago and Chicago was proud of him. She sent him to the Fifty-seventh and Fifty-eighth Congresses, and I doubt not he could have had any honor in her gift.

I knew Congressman MAHONEY well. We served together for several years on the same committee in this House. He was a good man and a true man. He had a genial, sunshiny nature, a kindly, sympathetic disposition, and an attractive, magnetic, popular personality. He quickly made friends, and the friend-

ships lasted for life. He was a friend of the poor, of the oppressed, and of the unfortunate. He was a lover of justice, a believer in the supremacy of law, and an advocate of every righteous cause. He stood for great principles, for fair play, for even-handed opportunity, and for equal rights to all, special privileges to none. He hated cant, spurned pretense, and despised hypocrisy. He was no skeptic—no cynic. He was an optimist, and not a pessimist. He loved mankind, and believed the world is growing better. He was a loving husband, an indulgent father, and a faithful friend. He will live in the hearts and the memories of those who knew him, and to do this is not to die. Death after all is but the crown of life—the opening of the door into the better, brighter sunshine of the undiscovered country in the great beyond.

WILLIAM F. MAHONEY was a successful man. His life work is done. He has run his course. He has kept the faith. His career on earth is finished, and he will reap his everlasting reward in the celestial land. We mourn with those who mourn his loss, and sympathize with his bereaved family. We grieve with those who grieve, and we comfort them as best we can, in our poor human way, with the consolation that his noble life, his generous character, his sympathies, his charities, his deeds of kindness, and his humanities will live forever and a day, and be his greatest monument—grander than marble or brass, and more enduring than the granite rocks of all the ages, for—

We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths;
In feelings, not in figures cold on the dial plate of time.

I arraign Russia before the bar of civilization
for great crimes against a common humanity.

*"Call the roll of the earth's illustrious dead and at least one name
in every five will be the immortal name of a distinguished Jew who
has stamped his indelible impress on the brightest pages of the world's
history."*

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

December 18, 1905.

WASHINGTON.
1905.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. SULZER.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, on the 11th day of this month (December, 1905) I introduced the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States, animated by the sympathy of a common humanity, view with deep sorrow, heartfelt commiseration, and poignant regret the deplorable condition of the people in Russia, and especially condemn and exceedingly deplore the cruel outrages, the unspeakable brutalities, and the unwarranted and wholesale assassinations of Russia's Jewish citizens; and

Whereas it is solemnly alleged, and there is a widespread and prevalent feeling throughout the world that it is true, that these terrible crimes, these brutal atrocities, and these willful murders of the Jews in Russia are connived at by the Russian Government, and have been incited by the Russian ruling classes, and are instigated directly or indirectly by high officials in Russia for political purposes, and have continued for a long time in all parts of Russia to such an extent that they have aroused the sympathies and shocked the moral sensibilities of the civilized world: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States, voicing the humanitarian sentiments of the American people, deplores the terrible crimes, the brutal outrages, and the uncalled-for and wanton murders of the Jews in Russia, and hereby condemns and denounces these awful outrages, these shocking assassinations, and these appalling atrocities as great international crimes against a common humanity that must be stopped, and stopped quickly, by the Russian Government; otherwise Russia, in the opinion of mankind, will and must stand indicted before the judgment bar of the world as beyond the pale of its civilization.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, that resolution expresses my sentiments in regard to the terrible crimes against the Jews in Russia; and, if I mistake not, it expresses the sentiments of most of the Members of this House of Representatives, and the heartfelt and sympathetic opinion of the humane and liberty-loving citizens of our country, who are shocked and grieved and outraged by the inhuman barbarities and appalling atrocities which have been going on for the past two years in Russia. During this short time, I am reliably informed by those most competent to testify, that more than 100,000 helpless Jews—men and women and children—absolutely defenseless and guilty of no wrong, have been cruelly, inhumanly, pitilessly, and barbarously murdered and butchered to make a Russian holiday. There has been nothing like it in all the history of the world, not even during the horrors of the Dark Ages, and humanity to-day stands aghast, stunned and grieved and horrified. It is simply impossible to describe the outrages on the Jews in Russia. Whole communities have been destroyed by fire and sword. No calamity of such magnitude has ever befallen Israel. All the horrors of the Inquisi-

tion, all the persecutions of the Middle Ages pale into insignificance in comparison with these stupendous crimes and appalling atrocities. The terrible bloody work is too frightful to contemplate; and yet we only know but a fragment of the awful truth. What a spectacle Russia presents at the dawn of the twentieth century!

Mr. Chairman, I feel deeply on this question. Only a few weeks ago 125,000 Jewish people, at the least calculation, relatives of the thousands and thousands of murdered Jews in Russia, marched through the streets in my Congressional district, clothed in somber black and crape, in a great mourning funeral procession for the martyred dead in Israel. It was one of the most impressive, one of the most striking, and one of the most pathetic scenes in all the history of the city of New York. Sadness and misery were written on every face. Bystanders took off their hats, bowed their heads in sympathy, and shed tears of sorrow. Nothing like it ever occurred before—Israel weeping and mourning for her dead—and I hope nothing like it will ever occur again in this land or any other.

But the murders go on. A veritable reign of terror exists. The black hand of ignorant fanaticism, race hatred, and religious bigotry has been raised throughout Russia against the law-abiding, peaceable, and defenseless Jews, and the barbaric work of rapine, plunder, outrage, and assassination continues and increases until even the heartless and hardened and superstitious Cossack is sickened by the bloody and ruthless scenes. Thousands and thousands of helpless men, women, and children are being slaughtered before the very eyes of civilization, and not a power lifts its voice in protest or raises a hand in condemnation. The facts—such as we get—are blood curdling and the numbers of the dead are appalling. Nothing like it ever occurred before in all the annals of time. It is a big, blood-red page in human history—a gigantic crime against a common humanity—and Russia must be forced to stop it. How, do you ask? I answer, How were the butcheries in Armenia stopped? How were the cruelties in Cuba ended? What did the powers do in China? Russia can, if Russia wants to do it, end these atrocities in a day. They must be stopped. The red reign of the Romanoffs must end. We can not look on longer without taking some decisive action. These crimes are great international crimes. The victims appeal to mankind, to the brotherhood of men, to the justice of the world. The massacres of Lodz and Odessa and Kishineff cry out to high heaven, and the time has come when the civilized world must tell Russia in no uncertain tones that these wholesale crimes against the Jews must cease, now and forever, or the civilization of this day will stand disgraced in the eyes of future generations. [Applause.]

Now, sir, I stand in my place on this floor, and charge on my responsibility as a Member of Congress, that it is solemnly alleged, and not denied, and there is a widespread and prevalent feeling throughout the world that it is true, that these terrible crimes of rapine and pillage and devastation, that these brutal atrocities, and that these monstrous murders of the helpless Jews in Russia, are secretly connived at by the Russian Government; that they have been incited by the Russian ruling classes—the grand dukes—and that they are instigated, directly

or indirectly, by high officials in Russia for religious and political purposes. What a fearful indictment of Russia! Is it true? We will know some day. It is not for me to say now, however, whether these fearful charges implicating the Russian Government with direct responsibility for these atrocities on the Jews in her dominions are true or not, impartial history, sooner or later, will reveal the truth and the whole truth, and I leave that awful charge to unerring Time. But I do stand here to-day and I do say that any nation that will permit, or that does permit, or that has permitted, these terrible assassinations to go on and continue, and makes no effort to check them, deserves the condemnation of the civilized world; and that we, the representatives of the American people, have the right, true to our traditions, voicing the sentiments of our constituencies and a common humanity, to cry out against these wholesale and willful crimes against a persecuted race, and denounce these barbarous outrages upon the Jews, and to notify Russia that, in our opinion, unless she stops, and stops immediately, these assassinations of the Jews, she will place herself, in the judgment of mankind, beyond the pale of civilization. That is the position I take now, and that is the position this House should take, and we should take it at once.

Mr. Chairman, I arraign Russia before the bar of civilization for great crimes against a common humanity. The Russian Government is responsible for these outrages on the Jews. She can not avoid the awful and tremendous responsibility. I believe that Russia could stop these murders if Russia wanted to stop them. These great crimes, sir, against an oppressed race, on account of race, are not local crimes; they go beyond State lines; they are great international crimes; they are butcheries of innocent men and women and children, and in the eyes of the Master these innocent victims are our brothers and our sisters, and we would be false to ourselves, to all that we revere and hold dear, and to every dictate of humanity, if we did not denounce and cry out against them with all the vehemence of our righteous American indignation. If we do not, ours will be the shame and ours the blame. We can not evade our responsibility by asking "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, I know it is said by those who speak for the Administration that our Government can do nothing; that the President and the Secretary of State can not act and have no power, according to international law, to intervene or to interfere in the internal affairs of Russia. That may or may not be true, but one thing is certain—it has been done in Turkey and in Cuba and in China; and another thing is sure, and that is, that we, the Representatives in Congress of the American people, have the right to raise our voice in protest against the plundering and the massacre, week in and week out, of thousands and thousands of poor, helpless, defenseless men, women, and children in Russia. We can do that. Let us do it. We aided the Greeks in their heroic struggle; we sympathized with the Irish in their aspirations; we interfered when the Turks massacred the Christians in Armenia, and we intervened with force of arms to aid the Cubans.

Why should we refrain from aiding the Jew in Russia? I say, in my judgment, it is our duty and the duty of the Government to condemn and denounce these Jewish atrocities and

to protest against these unspeakable crimes against the Jewish people in Russia in words that can not be misunderstood, and I believe that if we do, that if we pass this resolution, that it will have the desired result and effectively put a stop to the Russian Jewish outrages, atrocities, and massacres. That right we have; let us exercise it. It will be a declaration to Russia, to the Czar, and to the grand dukes, who are directly or indirectly responsible for these crimes, that the American people and the House of Representatives of the United States sympathize with the Russian Jews the same as we would with any other outraged and downtrodden and oppressed people, and that we are opposed to these race crimes and that the ruthless extermination of the Jews in Russia must cease. If this is all we can do, let us do it, and do it quickly; and I believe that if we do our protest, our condemnation, and our denunciation will be heard in St. Petersburg and that the Russian Government will quickly see to it that the wholesale butchery of Jewish communities is stopped. We can not ignore these crimes against humanity. We can not escape our duty and our responsibility. These innocent victims are our brothers and our sisters—mankind throughout the world are one. A great and continuing crime against one race is the concern of all the other races. Can anyone who believes in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man successfully deny it?

For mankind are one in spirit, and one instinct bears along,
Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong;
Whether conscious or unconscious, yet humanity's vast frame
Through its ocean-sundered fibers feels the gush of joy or shame—
In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have said that we do not know one-half of the truth regarding the terrible crimes against the Jews in Russia. The facts at present are unobtainable. Russia suppresses them. In the dying throes of their official power, the cruel and heartless rulers of Russia have sense enough to preclude the world from knowing the awful truth of the unprecedented barbarities that are taking place within their dominions. To their credit be it said that they have decency enough to be ashamed to let the light of publicity beat on their cruel infamies and their infamous butcheries. But murder will out, and sooner or later the bright light of investigation, searching for truth, will beat upon them more fiercely than ever. Then, and not till then, will the awful calamity of the Jews in Russia be known, and when it is known I predict the revelation will be the most frightful in the annals of time, and the blackest page in all history.

Mr. Chairman, my heart goes out to the ravished and plundered and oppressed Jews in Russia. I grieve with those who grieve for the dead. I sympathize with the living and the terror stricken. I have enlisted with all my soul in their cause, and in Congress and out of Congress I shall do all that I can to aid them to ameliorate their condition. I am not a bigot. I care naught for creed. I have no race prejudice. I stand for humanity, and a man is a man, for all that, to me. I have struggled all my life to help those who needed help, to do something to better the conditions of the poor and the humble, to aid oppressed humanity in every land and in every clime, and to raise the lowly and downtrodden to a higher plane and push

them forward a step further in the grand march of human progress. I shall continue my work along my own lines. I shall never turn back. I know my duty to my fellow-man, and it makes no difference to me whether he lives in the Orient or the Occident—whether he be Jew or gentile. In the battle for the right I can not go far wrong. There is nothing right but justice. I appeal for justice for the Jew, and I say to all the world that these outrages on the Jews in Russia must stop. I tell you that we can do our share to stop them. This resolution I offer is only a beginning. Let us pass it. Let us condemn and denounce the massacres of the helpless Jews in Russia, and that will accomplish something; and then let us hold a monster demonstration of protest—here in the capital of the Republic; here in the shadow of the White House—and demand, in the name of the American people and a common humanity, that official America, in a diplomatic way, serve notice on official Russia that the murders of the Jews in Russia must cease, and that will accomplish much more, and I believe effectually put a stop to these atrocities and devastations. A word from the President will go far to realize the object desired. A note of warning from the Secretary of State will have a most salutary effect. All the world applauded Theodore Roosevelt in using his good offices to bring about peace between Russia and Japan. We ask him now to use his good offices as President of the great Republic to bring peace to the harassed and maligned and outraged and persecuted Jew in Russia. He can do it if he will; and if he does, sorrowing humanity will place him on a higher pedestal, and a great race of grateful people will forever call him blessed.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to this House that I have the honor to represent in the heart of the city of New York one of the largest Jewish constituencies in the United States, and most of these people, or their parents, have come to our shores from Russia and southeastern Europe, and I want to say here, knowing them as I do, living among them, believing in them as I do, and respecting them as I do, that there are no better, no more loyal, and no more patriotic citizens in the United States. They are honest, sober, thrifty, industrious, liberty loving, and intelligent. They have come to our free land to escape the ostracism and the persecution of governments like Russia, and taking advantage of the opportunities vouchsafed them here, by frugality and industry, by perseverance and sobriety, by hope and tenacity of purpose, they have forged rapidly to the front in every line of endeavor, and they are to-day as good citizens as any other class of people in all our country. [Applause.] If anyone here will go over to the densely populated great East Side of New York, where I live, and where these people live, and where there are more people to the block than in any other like space on earth, he will be convinced of all I say regarding the Jew, and he will find among the throngs of school children in the public schools that the Jewish boys and the Jewish girls are among the brightest, the neatest, the aptest, the smartest, and the most intelligent. I know well these people; they know me, and have always been my friends; and I would be false to myself, false to my convictions, and false to every impulse of my nature, if I did not sympathize with them and do my best to

comfort and aid them in the day of their greatest sadness and affliction and calamity. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, just a word of truth for the Jew and I will conclude. It is, however, unnecessary for me, or any other man, to eulogize the intrepid sons and the virtuous daughters of Israel. The Jew needs no eulogy. All he asks is justice. All he demands is equal opportunity and equality before the law. The record of his race from the dawn of time down to the present day is the history of the march of humanity along the highways of progress and the avenues of civilization. In all ages of the world the ostracized and persecuted Jew has done his share for his fellow-man, for enlightenment, for liberty, for freedom, for progress, and for civilization—and he has done it all in the face of intense adverse circumstances. In science and in art, in literature and philanthropy, the Jew, in all lands and in all times, has written his name high in the temple of human fame. In statesmanship and diplomacy, in law and in medicine, in ethics and philosophy, in research and discovery, the greatness of the Jew is and ever has been unchallenged. In commerce and in trade, in industry and husbandry, overcoming forces that would deter another, he has held his own in the vanguard of progress. Persecuted for thousands of years he has surmounted all obstacles; shunned for centuries he has kept in the very front of the higher and the better civilization. In trial and in triumph, in tempest and in sunshine, in war and in peace, on land and sea, in all eras and in all places, the Jewish race has written its enduring name and its eternal fame all over the pages of human history. Civilization owes much to the Jew; Christianity owes more. Neither debt can ever be paid. Destroy what Israel has done for the human race and you leave a void that can not be filled—an abyss which can not be bridged. Call the roll of the earth's illustrious dead and at least one name in every five will be the immortal name of a distinguished Jew who has stamped his indelible impress on the brightest pages of the world's history. [Prolonged applause.]

MY BILL FOR TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA IS
FAVORED BY NINE-TENTHS OF THE PEOPLE
WHO ACTUALLY LIVE THERE.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

February 28, 1905.



WASHINGTON.
1905.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WM. SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 19150) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for prior years, and for other purposes—

The Clerk read as follows:

To pay amounts found due by the accounting officers of the Treasury on account of the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Territory of Alaska," for the fiscal year 1904, \$1.32.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend this paragraph on page 15, line 13, by striking out the word "Territory" and inserting the word "District." Alaska is not a Territory of the United States, although it belongs to the territory of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 13, strike out "Territory" and insert "District."

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] that the appropriation is made in this language for that year, and the deficiency should be appropriated for in the same language, or it might not be possible to use it.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I want to impart a little information to this House in regard to a matter of great importance to a large number of the people of this country. Alaska is not a Territory of the United States, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] and others imagine. It is a part of the territory of the United States, but not an organized Territory. It is only a district. I have been trying for a number of years to pass a bill giving Alaska a Territorial government. My bill is favored by nine-tenths of the people of Alaska who want Territorial government. But thus far I have not been able to pass this bill because nearly all the Members here know nothing about Alaska and her needs, and apparently do not seem to care.

The people of Alaska want a Territorial government. They want representation in this House. It is just, and they are entitled to this American right, because there is a large and ever-increasing body of the best kind of American citizens in Alaska—pioneers who are willing to forego the ease and luxury of life in the States to develop that great country. The best blood of a nation flows in the veins of its pioneers. They are the advance guard of progress. They have opened up in Alaska a mine of wealth that the world never dreamed of.

They have made Alaska commercially great, and for a decade have felt the need and practicability of a Delegate, and have been asking it from our hands for years. To-day, with a population doubled since the last census was taken and material financial interests increased in a still greater ratio, they ask you for this legislation.

My bill gives the people of Alaska the right to vote for and to elect a Delegate from Alaska to the House of Representatives who shall have the same rights and the same privileges in this body as a Delegate from any of the other Territories in the United States.

Alaska is entitled to that. No one can deny it. Her people should be heard on this floor, and the Alaskans want to be heard here by some one of their own selection—competent to speak for them. Some one vested with authority who will be responsible to them for what he says on the floor of this House regarding Alaskan matters, and who will be responsible to Congress as well. No one familiar with the facts can doubt that Alaska is entitled to Delegate representation. It is a fundamental principle of our theory of government that none of our citizens shall be taxed without just representation, and the Alaskans have been taxed by the Federal Government for years and years without representation and without having a voice in their own internal affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to Alaska several times. I know something about that vast domain. I know something about the sentiments of the people who live there, and I stand here and declare with the confident knowledge that I can not be successfully contradicted that the people of Alaska—the people who have gone there, and who have lived there for years, and who are bona fide residents of Alaska, and intend to stay there during the rest of their lives—I know what they want, and I declare here that they want not only a representative in Congress, but they want Territorial government. They want the right that every other Territory in the Union has—the right to make their own laws, to levy their own taxes, to regulate their own internal affairs, and to spend the money gathered by the tax collector for their own use, for their own schools, for their own charitable institutions, for their own municipal affairs, and for their own peace and happiness. This is not asking too much in my opinion. It seems to me it is only fair and just and proper and right. Alaska has a population at the present time upward of 100,000 bona fide residents. It is true they are scattered over a vast domain of territory. But it is also true that they are an honest, brave, sober, manly, God-fearing people, who are of our kin, and who ought to be treated as American citizens.

In this connection I want to read a part of a letter recently received by me from John W. Troy, a distinguished citizen of Skagway, and the editor of the *Daily Alaskan*, the leading daily newspaper in Alaska:

[The *Daily Alaskan*. Issued daily except Sunday. Leading newspaper of Alaska. Book and commercial printers. Oldest and largest daily paper in Alaska. Town & Jensen, publishers. John W. Troy, editor.]

SKAGWAY, ALASKA, *February 18, 1905.*

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SULZER: Many people of Alaska have been made to believe that the Dietrich bill will pass the two Houses of Congress at

the present session. I hope not. The bill is not satisfactory, and if it should become a law it will not work to the satisfaction of our people at all.

There is no reason under the sun, Mr. SULZER, why there should be a change in the system of government given the people of Alaska from that which has been provided for other pioneer peoples. They should have a Territorial government, as Ohio, Nebraska, Washington, and all the other of the Western States had before their admission to the Union and as Hawaii has now. However, if we are to be treated as the Philippines and Porto Ricans are now being treated, let the legislative commission be larger than that proposed by Senator Dietrich and let it be representative of the people. No one questions the good faith of the President, but we should not be required to accept our laws at the hands of four men appointed by any power on earth.

The Dietrich bill makes Governor Brady and three other men to be appointed by the President a majority of a legislative commission, of which three men are to be elected by the people. Your experience will tell you how easy it would be for the members of such a commission to "get their heads together" and do things that the people would want undone very badly.

If we are to have a legislative commission let there be nine or more members. Fifteen would not be too many. Let their terms of office be two instead of four years. Four years is a long time in the history of Alaska. There is no reason on earth why the pay of the commissioners should be \$5,000 per year. They need not meet for more than thirty days or sixty days per year. The \$30,000 provided for their salaries would pay fifteen men amply for their services. And we want all the commissioners elected by the people. The success that has attended municipal government in Alaska is a sufficient guaranty that the electorate of this district can be trusted, and the Delegate in Congress should also be elected by the people.

It were far better that we have no legislation than that this Dietrich bill be forced upon us in its present shape. It is iniquitous in every respect. It seems to me, in view of the fact that the last Democratic national convention declared for Territorial government for Alaska, that we ought to be able to depend upon the Democrats in the House and the Senate to save us from this miscarriage, which receives its only Alaskan support from office seekers and Tories. If such a bill was proposed for Porto Rico, the Philippines, the Hawaiian Islands, or any other outlandish place, inhabited by any other race of people than white Americans, the people would be up in arms. Can we not get your friends in Congress to refuse aid to and to fight to the death this misfit legislation? Believe me, the people of Alaska, those who live in the district, would ten thousand times prefer no legislation than this abomination.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. TROY,
Editor Daily Alaskan.

That letter speaks for itself.

I agree with Mr. Troy. A Delegate from an unorganized Territory would be not only a departure from all former precedent, but in the case of Alaska might be much more productive of evil than of beneficial results. In the absence of any form of local government, it may be impossible for a Delegate to properly represent the will and the wishes of the people, because of a lack of knowledge in the premises. I know that the people of Alaska are, in every point of view, abundantly capable of maintaining a local form of government, such as has always heretofore been accorded the Territories of the United States. An organic act should be passed according to Alaska the measure of self-government to which her people are justly entitled, and which has never heretofore, except in the case of Alaska, been withheld from any considerable body of American citizens engaged in the settlement of a new district.

Looking at the question in the light of the past, and by way of comparison with other portions of our country that have been made Territories in our Union, I believe that Alaska is more entitled to-day to Territorial government than seven-tenths of the other Territories that were organized. I am opposed, as a mat-

ter of right, and of justice, and of principle, to taxing the Alaskan people, gathering the taxes by a Federal tax collector, and, instead of giving the taxes to the people of Alaska for their own local purposes, depositing the money in the Federal Treasury and trying to govern Alaska from the Treasury Department or by the Congress, when nine-tenths of the men in Congress know absolutely nothing about the people up there, nor the country, either.

We ought to do something for Alaska ere we adjourn. It is a shame the way Congress treats Alaska. It is un-American, undemocratic, and unrepblican. It is a disgrace to the fundamental principles of American citizenship. I cry out against governing Alaska like a conquered province in the days of the ancient Romans. I have done all I could for Alaska since I have been a Member of Congress, but I have not been able to make much progress; but I shall keep up the fight for the right until the people of Alaska get what they want, what they demand as American citizens—namely, home rule, Territorial government, with the right to elect a Delegate from the Territory to the House of Representatives, the same as Oklahoma, the same as Arizona, and the same as New Mexico do now.

I say it is an outrage on the citizens of Alaska—these brave, industrious pioneers who have gone to Alaska from every State in the Union, who have made it their home, who intend to live and die there, and who are developing her vast mineral resources, her great agricultural resources, and the other important resources of that vast empire in our great Northwest—I say it is an outrage and a shame that the Congress of the United States does not give those good and worthy citizens a representative of their own choosing in the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, sir, it is a fundamental principle of American patriotism—a saying in this country since Revolutionary days—"No taxation without representation." The fathers of the Republic fought for that principle; but, strange as it may seem, more than a century afterwards the Congress of the United States denies the citizens of the district of Alaska Territorial government and representation, and taxes them every year without their consent several hundred thousand dollars, which is turned into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, every newspaper in Alaska to-day, I believe, is in favor of Territorial government. The Democrats and the Republicans in two Alaska conventions recently held have unanimously passed resolutions in favor of Territorial government. There is not a man in Alaska to-day, in my judgment, who is a bona fide resident of Alaska, and who intends to stay there and live there, who is not in favor of Territorial government. If anyone here doubts what I say, let him go to Alaska this summer and find out for himself. I know my bill can not be passed now, as the Fifty-eighth Congress will adjourn in a few days, but in the next Congress I hope that something will be done about this matter and that necessary legislation will be passed to give the people of Alaska a representative government, so that they can manage their own affairs. Now everything that is done here for Alaska is done in Congress by people who have never been in Alaska, by people who know abso-

lutely nothing about that wonderful country, and who do not know the wants of the people up there any more than they do about the wants of the people in Mars. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], laudable as they have been for Alaska, and his failure to pass his Alaskan Territorial bill, are one proposition; but the Appropriations Committee met a condition and not a theory. The first appropriation—

Mr. SULZER. Then the Appropriation Committee ought to meet a theory now and then. But I have been talking about the unjust and humiliating conditions in Alaska. There is no theory about that, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the former appropriation used the word "Territory" and not "district," and in order to meet the deficiency to the original appropriation it was absolutely necessary that the committee should use the same technical word, and that is all there is in it.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the technical mistake, it is true, has been made in the designation of Alaska as a "Territory," when Alaska is only a "district." The mistake proves all I have said about the ignorance of Members concerning Alaska, and it ought to be corrected, and now is the time to correct it. It does not affect the appropriation a particle, but simply keeps the record straight. I am in favor of the appropriation.

OLD IRONSIDES.

The Constitution Must Not be Destroyed—
We Won't Give Up the Ship.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1905.

WASHINGTON.

1905.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 42) for the distribution of the President's message—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: A few days ago I introduced into this House the following resolution, which I now send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it has been published in the newspaper press of the country, and is now generally believed, that the Secretary of the Navy has recommended and contemplates the breaking up and the absolute destruction of the last vestige of one of the most famous historical relics of the United States, namely, the frigate *Constitution*, lovingly, patriotically, and popularly known as Old Ironsides; and

Whereas the patriotic people of the country regard such contemplated destruction of Old Ironsides with the most profound sorrow and regret, and as an irreparable loss, because Old Ironsides can never be replaced and her like can never be looked upon again if once totally destroyed; and they believe that if only one of her planks remains it should be sacredly saved and preserved as an historic relic: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to send to the House of Representatives as soon as possible all information upon the subject of the contemplated destruction of the frigate *Constitution*, popularly known as Old Ironsides, and in the meantime to await such further action as the Congress may deem proper to take to prevent such destruction; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby respectfully and earnestly requested to promptly intervene and recommend such measures as shall secure the permanent preservation of all that now remains of the frigate *Constitution* as one of the most sacred historical relics remaining to the people of the United States.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, that is a patriotic resolution and it speaks for itself. I am in favor of it, and I believe it should pass this House without delay. It was introduced by me for the purpose of getting definite information and finding out, through the Secretary of the Navy, as soon as possible, just when, and how, and where, and why the Secretary of the Navy proposed, intended, or contemplated the destruction of the frigate *Constitution*, popularly known to the American people as "Old Ironsides," and what authority, if any, he has in the premises to destroy this historical relic of the American Navy.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SULZER. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Do I understand that it is offered as a resolution to be passed on by the committee?

Mr. SULZER. Not at all. It has just been read by the Clerk for the purpose of giving the House notice of what I am going to talk about.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, all right.

Mr. SULZER. I introduced the resolution for the purpose of getting information from the Secretary of the Navy about the frigate *Constitution* and her proposed destruction. It is privileged under the rules and will come up ere long in the regular way. We do not know just how the old *Constitution* is to be shot to death, but if it is going to happen, I think the House is entitled to have this information from the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. DALZELL. All right.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the patriotic people of the country were very much surprised a short time ago when they read in the public prints that the Secretary of the Navy proposed to destroy "Old Ironsides," the flagship of Hull and Preble, of Bainbridge, and of gallant Charles Stewart, the grandfather of Charles Stewart Parnell. The Secretary said, if the reports in the newspapers are correct, and I doubt not they are, that this old frigate, the *Constitution*, now lying at Charlestown Navy-Yard, in Boston Harbor, was of no earthly use, and the best thing that could be done with her was to tow her out to sea and make her a target for American naval gunners to shoot to pieces. Think of it! Imagine, if you can, this official vandalism! It shocked public sentiment. It aroused American patriotism. I can hardly believe it to be true, but if it is true I trust the Secretary of the Navy has heard the indignant remonstrance and the patriotic protest which has rolled into Washington from every part of the country, and that he will do nothing further in the matter. His action has aroused the spirit of the nation. The American people will never consent to the wanton destruction of the frigate *Constitution*; and, in fact, sir, I doubt if the Secretary of the Navy has any authority to order her demolition. She belongs to the people of the United States, and they will never sell her or give her up; and the Secretary has no more right to destroy her than he has to order the destruction of this Capitol. I think that the Congress has something to say about what shall be done or not done with the people's property, and I hope the Secretary will refrain from further action in the premises until this Congress can act in the matter. Her fate is in our hands. She can not be shot and sunk without our consent. We must stop this sacrilege. The venerable old frigate *Constitution* should not be destroyed. She is sacred to the American people, and as long as one of her timbers remains she should never be demolished. She was launched in the harbor of Boston in 1797. Her story on the sea is American history, and time can not dim her greatness nor sully her glory. She belongs to Boston, and there let her rest in peace with the Stars and Stripes floating from her masthead until she shall crumble and rot away and be no more. [Applause.]

Once before, Mr. Chairman—a long time ago, away back in 1830—a certain former Secretary of the Navy also proposed the destruction of "Old Ironsides." Is the present Secretary of the Navy familiar with that incident? Does he remember what then happened? Has he forgotten the storm of protests, the white heat of popular indignation, that aroused the people and stirred

the very depths of American patriotism? The people then saved the *Constitution* and the storm of outraged popular sentiment subsided; but at its height there came a flash of poetic lightning, the inspiration of Oliver Wendell Holmes, who wrote this poem on "Old Ironsides":

Ay, tear her tattered ensign down!
 Long has it waved on high,
 And many an eye has danced to see
 That banner in the sky.
 Beneath it rung the battle shout
 And burst the cannon's roar—
 The meteor of the ocean air
 Shall sweep the clouds no more.

Her deck, once red with heroes' blood,
 Where knelt the vanquished foe,
 When winds were hurrying o'er the flood
 And waves were white below,
 No more shall feel the victor's tread
 Or know the conquered knee—
 The harpies of the shore shall pluck
 The eagle of the sea!

Oh, better that her shattered hulk
 Should sink beneath the wave;
 Her thunders shook the mighty deep,
 And there should be her grave;
 Nail to the mast her holy flag,
 Set every threadbare sail,
 And give her to the god of storms,
 The lightning and the gale!

[Applause.]

That gem, sir, from the pen of dear old Doctor Holmes did much in the long ago to save the day and preserve intact "Old Ironsides." As I sat here to-day thinking about the contemplated action of our present Secretary my memory went back to that other time. It seemed like history repeating itself, and I wondered if our Naval Secretary—poor benighted man—had ever read that patriotic poem by one of America's most gifted authors. But no matter; suffice it now for me to say that from that day in the distant past down to the present more practical time no sacrilegious hand has ever been raised to strike a blow against "Old Ironsides." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this may be a practical age, but American sentiment is not dead, and it is well that there is enough left to arouse the people in protest against destroying in a most unpatriotic way the gallant old ship *Constitution*. If only a sentimental value is left of all her greatness, it is enough to save her, and it is a very beautiful sentiment, and one altogether creditable to the hearts of the American people. This sentiment fights our battles, wins our victories, and preserves our liberties. Sentiment—deep-rooted, patriotic sentiment—is the progressive life of every people. and I trust the day will never come in our land when it will slumber so soundly that an unsympathetic act of vandalism can not arouse it to protest and action and indignation. The doom of the Republic will be knelled when American sentiment dies. So, sir, I say that for sentimental and patriotic reasons the frigate *Constitution* must not be destroyed. No act of vandalism must ever profane "Old Ironsides." Her glorious ensign must never be hauled down. She is the most valuable relic historically, and the most priceless possession to-day, in the American Navy. No wonder the patriotic people of New England, and elsewhere, were grieved

and shocked when they learned that the Secretary of the Navy, in the most matter-of-fact way, intended to have this historic old ship of war towed out to sea and shot at for a target—shot to death with American gunpowder and by the Navy she made possible and did so much to embellish. But it shall never happen—perish the thought—because I believe I voice the patriotic feelings of all true Americans everywhere when I say we shall never give up the ship—we shall never destroy “Old Ironsides.” [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am a friend of the Secretary of the Navy. I have no disposition to harshly criticise that distinguished official. I think in this matter that he has been, to say the least, indiscreet, and has mistaken the patriotic sentiments which animate the American people, especially when some object of their reverence is assailed. Hence I believe it is only necessary for us to suggest to him that we are opposed to the destruction of this good old ship in order to preserve her as a common heritage for future generations. And that is for us to do—our work and our duty. Let us then meet the expectations of the people of our country, and put into the naval appropriation bill a provision that will carry a small annual appropriation for the care and the maintenance of this venerable old ship *Constitution*, and that will end the doubts as to her future most effectually for all time to come.

And now, sir, I want to read another poem anent this matter. After I had introduced the resolution just read by the Clerk, my dear old friend, the good gray poet of Washington, a son of old Kentucky, and as gallant, as warm-hearted, and as lovable a man as ever lived—Col. John A. Joyce—inspired by the subject as his prototype, Oliver Wendell Holmes, was on a former and similar occasion, dashed off the following poem and sent it to me to read when this matter came up for discussion. I take great pleasure in reading it:

Spare, oh, spare, the *Constitution*;
 Grand old battle ship of ours.
 Let it live in song and story,
 Festooned with the fairest flowers.
 Leave it as an object lesson
 To the children of this land,
 Teaching loyalty and valor,
 Lessons they must understand.
 Hull and Prebel, Bainbridge, Stewart,
 Fired thy guns in battle roar,
 Slaughtered Albion's bravest sailors—
 Sunk and drove them from our shore.
 Congress true and patriotic
 Will not let thy glory die;
 But be “target” for all praising
 Like the stars in yonder sky.
 Once you fought on stormy ocean,
 “Target” for the tyrant foe;
 Must “Old Ironsides” be shattered,
 Friendless in its age and woe?
 No! Let it shine in Boston Harbor,
 Down the ages, by the sea;
 Veteran of our naval glory—
 Emblem of our liberty!

[Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, all honor to Colonel Joyce. He is now, and always has been, a true poet and a pure patriot. And now a

few words more, and I am done. I want to say, in conclusion, that I am a friend of the American Navy. I glory in its brilliant and illustrious achievements. In every war and on every sea its valor and its heroism have illumined the pages of American history. There is no blot on its heraldic shield. The patriotic soul of every school boy in America has been fired by the valor, the bravery, and the glory of our naval heroes. Their motto is, and was, and ever will be, "Don't give up the ship;" and we, the Representatives of the American people in Congress, reechoing that heroic and patriotic sentiment, send greetings to our constituencies, and notice to the Secretary of the Navy, that we won't give up the ship; that we won't sacrifice "Old Ironsides;" that we won't destroy the *Constitution*—the oldest and the grandest and the proudest ship that ever nailed her colors to the mast in all the glorious history of the American Navy. [Prolonged applause.]

6397

O

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

IN RELATION TO

COLUMBUS DAY

(H. R. 17350).

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE:

JOHN J. JENKINS, WISCONSIN, *Chairman*.
RICHARD WAYNE PARKER, NEW JERSEY.
DE ALVA S. ALEXANDER, NEW YORK.
CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD, MAINE.
ROBERT M. NEVIN, OHIO.
HENRY W. PALMER, PENNSYLVANIA.
GEORGE A. PEARRE, MARYLAND.
JAMES N. GILLET, CALIFORNIA.
CHARLES Q. TIRRELL, MASSACHUSETTS.

JOHN A. STERLING, ILLINOIS.
BENJAMIN P. BIRDSALL, IOWA.
JOHN H. FOSTER, INDIANA.
DAVID A. DE ARMOND, MISSOURI.
DAVID H. SMITH, KENTUCKY.
HENRY D. CLAYTON, ALABAMA.
ROBERT L. HENRY, TEXAS.
JOHN S. LITTLE, ARKANSAS.
WILLIAM G. BRANTLEY, GEORGIA.

WASHINGTON:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

1906.

COLUMBUS DAY.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., Saturday, April 28, 1906.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. John J. Jenkins in the chair.

The committee thereupon proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17350) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day." Said bill is as follows:

A BILL To make October twelfth in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the twelfth day of October in each and every year, being the anniversary day of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, be, and the same hereby is, made a legal public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, to all intents and purposes in the same manner as the first Monday of September in each year is now made by law a public and legal holiday.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM SULZER, REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee, I shall occupy your attention this morning for only a few moments to present my views in favor of my bill now pending before this committee to make the 12th day of October a legal holiday, to be called "Columbus Day."

There are a number of prominent citizens here this morning, from different parts of our country, who desire to be heard in favor of this bill, and I would much rather give them all the time which the committee has granted to us on this hearing than occupy any of it myself. So I shall be very brief in my remarks, and then shall take pleasure in introducing to the committee these gentlemen who have come here at considerable inconvenience to advocate this bill, and to tell you why, in their opinion, it should be favorably reported and passed by Congress.

This bill of mine, Mr. Chairman, to make the 12th day of October in each and every year a legal holiday, and to be known as "Columbus Day," was prepared and introduced by me in response to what I believe to be a general sentiment prevailing throughout the country. It is not a sectional sentiment, but a desire entirely general in the broadest significance of that term.

In my judgment the greatest event in a thousand years, in the history of civilization, and for the benefit of humanity, was the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus on the 12th day of October, 1492.

It wrote a great epoch page in the earth's history, changed the map of the world, revolutionized science, and lifted man to a higher plane and pushed him forward a gigantic step in the glorious march of progress.

It swept away the cobwebs of the dark ages, killed superstition, revived learning, stimulated individual endeavor, opened the gates of opportunity, gave to the Old World a new world—with natural resources beyond the dreams of avarice, and that has become in four centuries all that we are and all that we hope to be—two great continents, inhabited by the greatest and most progressive people on earth. Why should we not fittingly commemorate this immortal event?

If there is any day in all our history that ought to be celebrated it is the anniversary of the discovery of our Western Hemisphere. It should be a legal holiday from Point Barrow to Cape Horn—the gladdest day in all our glad some year—from the Atlantic to the Pacific—from the Arctic to the Antarctic—and I predict ere many years come and go it will be the one great Pan-American holiday.

Every American honors the name and fame of Christopher Columbus; and every American wants to celebrate Columbus Day as the one great glad some day in all the history of the Western World.

We are the great Republic. We should be foremost in this all-American movement.

If we make the 12th of October a legal holiday, it will come midway between Labor Day (the first Monday in September) and Thanksgiving Day, and will be, I think, the second legal holiday to be created by act of Congress.

I know, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that it is claimed by some that we have too many holidays now, but I do not sympathize with that claim. I am in favor of holidays now and then as days of rest and recreation for our people, and I believe these holidays make better men and women, accomplish much general good, and are beneficial to our country. It is an old saying that "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy;" and a holiday now and then should be welcomed by the wisest statesmen in the interest of the toiler and his family. Every member of this committee should favor this bill, and I hope you will report it and pass it ere we adjourn.

I believe that if this bill is enacted into law it will have a far-reaching influence for good and a beneficial effect for the betterment of our citizens. It will be a patriotic day—a joyous day—without a recollection of sadness. There should be no opposition to this bill. This holiday will come in the fall of the year, at an opportune time after the hot weather of the summer, when the leaves are turning and nature is beginning to put on her winter garb; and it will be well for all our people, especially those who toil, to take a day off and go with their wives and their children to the country and the seashore, and while communing with nature contemplate all that has been accomplished here since Columbus first sighted land on the Western Hemisphere on that fateful 12th day of October, 1492.

The CHAIRMAN. Your bill is drawn on the theory, I see, Mr. Sulzer, that this should be a legal holiday all over the United States.

Mr. SULZER. I drew the bill, Mr. Chairman, after the form of the only other legal holiday in the United States made by Congress, and that is Labor Day.

Mr. PARKER. Labor Day is made a holiday in the same manner as certain other days that are District holidays, and only District holidays.

Mr. SULZER. That is all Congress can do, and all I want done with this bill.

Mr. PARKER. And if this bill had been drawn in that way it would have gone to the District Committee, I suppose. The bill about Labor Day went to the District Committee, and it was drawn in such a blind way that you could not tell whether it was a District holiday or for the whole United States. But have any legislatures made this a legal holiday?

Mr. SULZER. I am not certain, but I think only one.

Mr. PARKER. Which one is that?

Mr. SULZER. The legislature of the State of Colorado.

The CHAIRMAN. The power of Congress of course is limited to the District of Columbia and the Territories.

Mr. SULZER. Of course I understand that, Mr. Chairman, and that is all that this bill can do. But what I am trying to do is to get this bill through Congress, and I know that if it passes Congress every State in the Union will take it up and make it a statute.

As I say, I think the State of Colorado is the only State that has made Columbus Day a legal holiday by act or by executive proclamation. I want to say that at the commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus the legislature of the State of New York passed a bill to celebrate that event; and the celebration lasted for one week, and was the greatest festival of its kind ever held in this country.

The only holiday which Congress has created in all its existence is the holiday known as Labor Day. The Fourth of July, Washington's Birthday, Decoration Day, Christmas, and all these other holidays are not legal holidays by act of Congress. Some of the States have made them legal holidays and some have not; but these holidays are celebrated in a general way by the people all over the country.

Now, Mr. Chairman. I must go to another committee meeting; and that is all I desire to say at this time. At some future time I expect to make a speech in favor of this bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. I do not want to take up the time of the committee myself this morning, as I wish the committee to hear the distinguished gentlemen who have come from other cities to speak in favor of the bill.

I will therefore ask to introduce to the committee Hon. Antonio Zucca, president of the Italian Chamber of Commerce; and when he finishes he will introduce to the committee Hon. Vito Contessa, president of the Sons of Colombo; Victor L. Zorn, president of the United Fruit Importers; Hon. P. P. Acritelli, coroner of the city of New York; Joseph Rinaldi, of the city of New York, and John J. Freschi, who is the secretary of a very large Italian association in that city. I bespeak for these gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, a courteous hearing in

regard to this matter which they all have so much at heart, and which I sincerely hope, at its convenience, this committee will see its way clear to make a favorable report upon; and I ask that the press clippings, resolutions I have received in this matter, be attached to the statements in this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SULZER. I now take pleasure in introducing to the committee former Coroner Zucca, of the city of New York, and the president of the Italian Chamber of Commerce.

**STATEMENT OF ANTONIO ZUCCA, ESQ., OF 225 WEST STREET,
NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.**

Mr. ZUCCA. Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee: As president of the Italian Chamber of Commerce, I come before you to support the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, to make October 12 of each year a national holiday, to be called Columbus Day, in memory of the great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

The Italian Chamber of Commerce, being a commercial institution, does not readily favor the enactment of new holidays, but on considering that Christopher Columbus discovered this great country, thus providing new homes to the over populated Europe, and that millions of people through his discovery have ameliorated their condition, having become prosperous and many of them wealthy, the said chamber of commerce believes it to be the duty of the Government of this country to thus recognize and honor the benefactor of its people; if any man deserves to be remembered by the United States of America it is Christopher Columbus, who suffered all kinds of hardship, imprisonment, and privation from his own contemporaries. Forgotten by previous generations benefited by his discovery, it becomes our duty to censure the negligence of our predecessors by now doing him justice in the enactment of the bill introduced, as I have before said, by the Hon. William Sulzer, and have the 12th day of October made a national holiday from the Gulf of Mexico to Canada, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, when probably the nations of South and Central America and even Canada will follow our example. At the present time it is a State holiday in Colorado, and such a bill passed the assembly and the senate of the State of New York, but in consequence of the governor's refusal to sign, failed to become law.

The same sentiment has been expressed in the legislature of Louisiana, Dakota, and other States. Therefore it is certain that the same opinion exists to-day to thus honor the man who was not even privileged to name the country discovered by him. It now remains with Congress, which includes all the States, to make right the wrong of our predecessors.

**STATEMENT OF VITO CONTESSA, ESQ., OF 413 EAST ONE HUNDRED
AND FOURTEENTH STREET, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.**

Mr. CONTESSA. Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee: For the past eight years the Italian Benevolent Society "Sons of Columbus," of which I am the president, under the auspices of the United Italian

Societies of Greater New York, has most duly celebrated the 12th of October as Columbus Day.

Each year thousands and thousands of men of all nationalities cooperated both morally and financially to the success of the commemoration of one of the greatest glories in favor of science and humanity.

Gentlemen, Christopher Columbus with the discovery of America gave to the world a new world; he opened the way to the promised land of labor, liberty, and equality.

This great country should be inferior to no other nation in gratitude, and worthily remember the great intrepid navigator by considering the 12th of October—Columbus Day—a national holiday.

STATEMENT OF VICTOR L. ZORN, ESQ., OF 81 BEACH STREET, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

MR. ZORN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee: A people's gratitude to men who have rendered distinguished services to their country, or to mankind at large, can not well be more appropriately expressed than by perpetuating their memory through the establishment of public holidays on days marking either the date of their birth, or the occasion of their most notable achievement. Through the legislative enactment of our several States, we celebrate the anniversary of the birth of Washington, the natal day of our independence, and the anniversary of the birth of the lamented Lincoln. On what has come to be known as Decoration Day we suspend our labors, and upon the graves of our fallen soldiers we place the floral offerings of a people's love. So, too, on one day in each year we close our houses of industry and commerce and our public offices and financial institutions in testimony of our appreciation of the worth and majesty of labor. It is now proposed that a legal holiday be established to commemorate a great event and do partial justice to the memory of a man whose services to America and to mankind transcend all estimate. A bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States, and is now before you for consideration, providing that October 12 of each year be declared a legal holiday to be known as Columbus Day. He whom we would thus honor was not an American citizen; but his skill as a mariner, and his courage and determination in spite of repeated discouragements, and the ridicule and rebuffs of his contemporaries, laid the foundation upon which the splendid structure of our country was afterwards builded. Christopher Columbus was an Italian by birth and a citizen of all the world by sympathy and universal interest. It were but a tardy recognition of the debt of America to him to make a legal holiday of the anniversary of his landing at San Salvador.

The New York Fruit Exchange, which I have the honor to represent, embraces within its membership all the representative men engaged in the wholesale fruit business in the city of New York. This exchange, acting for these practical men of affairs, has adopted resolutions indorsing the bill introduced by Representative William Sulzer, and directing me to appear before you to urge a favorable report upon it. Business men as a class are not sentimentalists, and those engaged in the fruit business are no exception to the rule. Yet

they indorse this bill and are anxious that it shall be passed by Congress. We have too few holidays, rather than too many. Our minds and our bodies are improved by recreation, and we are exalted by reflection upon the noble deeds and great achievements of others. It is an admitted principle of economics that the efficiency of labor is enhanced and not impaired by periods of rest. Viewed, therefore, merely in a material and an economic light, there is no solvent objection to this bill, and there are many reasons why it should receive your favorable consideration. In the history of all the world there is no more momentous event than the discovery of America. Assuredly the memory of the discoverer ought to be preserved. There is no more effective and appropriate way to preserve it than to enact into law the provisions of the bill which the Hon. William Sulzer has introduced. Make a favorable report upon this bill, gentlemen, and enjoy the satisfaction which will be yours of knowing that you have done your share toward honoring the name of Christopher Columbus.

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. FECHTIG, JR., ESQ., CALVERT BUILDING, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. FECHTIG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I come with a committee from Baltimore representing all the Italian societies of that city. Baltimore, as you know, has a very large Italian population—a population of at least 15,000 voting strength. The Italian societies there are unanimous in their indorsement of this measure, and they are encouraged in support of the bill by other organizations in Baltimore in addition to their own.

The object of this hearing is that the advocates of Mr. Sulzer's bill, to make October 12 in each year a legal holiday, to be known as "Columbus day," may be afforded an opportunity of urging upon you the advisability of an early and favorable report upon the bill.

I know that there is a reluctance to create additional holidays. This reluctance is a most proper one. Our history, as well as our industrial life, is so full of memorable events that to single out many of them truly worthy of such notice would make too many days upon which the people were urged to a cessation from work and to a contemplation of the event and the lesson to be derived therefrom. There are, however, certain times and events in the life of the nation which, by reason of preeminence, are entitled to be dealt with and celebrated by all the people. We honor the birthday of Jesus Christ, we enjoy the beginning of each new calendar year, we pay our respects and homage to the memory of the first President, we decorate the graves of the nation's warriors, we celebrate the declaration of freedom from tyranny, we join with labor in its day's reflection upon its achievements, and we utter our thanks each year for the bounties of the Almighty.

We are essentially a patriotic people; we are ever ready to praise anyone and everyone who in any manner has contributed to the up-building of the nation.

There is one man whose part in the foundation of the peopling and growth of the Western Continent can never be overlooked. He was an Italian—of those energetic people who have in many ages contributed so much that is best in art and science to the sum of the

world's knowledge. He in the crowning act of his life revealed to the world a new hemisphere, a new continent of wealth and vast possibilities. It was his act, whatever others did before him or whatever may have been done after him, which gave the opportunity for the greatest nation of freemen in the world's history. He died in comparative obscurity, and his mortal remains lie in Spain practically unhonored.

The great event of October 12, 1492, must ever be a landmark and a great lesson in our history. It must stand in its effects as a monumental performance. A portion of our people, most of them of his own racial blood, have from time to time done honor to the memory of Christopher Columbus, have erected tablets and monuments, have voiced his praises in song, and drunk to his achievements in wine; but there has been no organized effort to commemorate the day as it should be. Just lately in some of the States legislation has been attempted. Colorado has made the day a holiday. New York and other States, I am informed, have it under consideration, but the fitting method of dealing with the subject is by the passage of the bill now before this committee. Its recommendation by this body and its enactment into law will create a holiday as noteworthy as any known to our people. It is for these reasons that, in common not only with those of Italian blood who are making in our midst part of the sinew of our best citizenship, but as well with those of other bloods, we now urge upon you an early and favorable report upon this measure.

**STATEMENT OF MICHAEL A. ROFRANO, ESQ., SUPERINTENDENT
TENEMENT HOUSE DEPARTMENT, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.**

Mr. ROFRANO. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee. I appear here as the representative of the Italian-American League, a civic association of young Americans whose parents were of Italian birth, to say that we are heartily in favor of the bill before this committee making Columbus Day a national holiday.

We believe with the great majority of the American people that one day in the year should be set aside to honor the memory of one of the world's greatest men and benefactors.

The reasons for this show of sentiment are so many and so weighty as to leave no ground for real opposition.

America's debt to Columbus can never be paid. The history of these United States, with its story of grand achievements and great heroes, would never be written were it not for Columbus. But for the great mariner this nation would be unknown; July 4th have no significance; freedom, perhaps, no home, and liberty no hope, and the magnificent civilization now enjoyed by the world no existence.

Columbus deserves all the honors that the American people can give their first and greatest hero.

I thank you, gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF P. P. ACRIPELLI, ESQ., OF NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

Mr. ACRIPELLI. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is befitting that the National Congress should take some step to push forward the propaganda that is being made all over the United

States for the enactment into law of a bill making the 12th day of October of each year a legal holiday.

Of course Congress can only legislate on matters touching the District of Columbia and the Territories. But that of itself will be an inspiration to the States of this Union to pass a law on just the same principle, and not only to the States of this Union, gentlemen, but also to the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I understand that the Argentine Republic has passed such a law, and that the Congress of Brazil is now considering it. The Congress of the United States, which a few years ago so honored the memory of Columbus by generously donating large sums of money to the Chicago Exposition, should not stop there, but should also go further and perpetuate his memory by enacting a legal holiday law. We, the Italian-American citizens of New York, have done our share. One of the finest monuments in this continent has been erected by the Italians of the United States in one of the finest squares of New York to the memory of Columbus. But monuments, gentlemen, may crumble; but a law passed by the Congress of the United States honoring the memory of Columbus will be perpetual, and will make it so that every nation which is benefited by the great discoverer's achievements will also enact such a law, so that the whole civilized world will honor his memory forever.

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. FRESCHI, ESQ., OF 53 PARK ROW, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

Mr. FRESCHI. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen: October 12 is a day of great importance and of interest to the whole world. All nations should celebrate on that day. The discovery of America opened up to the Old World new avenues of commerce and expansion. It was the beacon light in the centuries that followed it that pointed out the course to the many adventurers who sought new territory free from the laws of serfdom, free from all religious persecutions and oppression.

On that day we are reminded that for two score and ten years Columbus, the prince of discoverers, the humble mariner and adventurer, whose name we all revere, was continuously in excited action, seeking to interest crowned heads in his plans, and finally sailed under the flag of Castile and Leon from Palos, on August 3, 1492, in search of Japan and India, the land of spices and its reputed jewels. He pursued a westerly course in the hope that a direct route to Asia lie across the "Sea of Darkness"—the mighty Atlantic—that separated it from continental Europe.

At the dawn of day on October 12, 1492, the great admiral landed on one of the Bahamas. He thought that he had accomplished his purpose and object for which he had set sail. The year 1492 was an epoch-making year.

"The first voyage of Columbus is thus a unique event in the history of mankind. Nothing like it was ever done before and nothing like it can ever be done again."

We should celebrate not only the event, but glory as well in the life and deeds of the man who made that event possible.

The world owes his name the foremost place in history. And

though he be long dead his deeds have survived him and his memory shall live forever.

Columbus was a type of the wonderful man, and possessed a character remarkable for the strength of its constituent parts. He was a man of original thoughts. His convictions were the products of a keen mind, and the determination with which he would apply them made success inevitable. The zeal and energy exerted by him toward a cause was emblematical of the man.

Our entire country, whose material prosperity, whose mental wealth, whose physical strength, and whose moral rectitude was made possible by what he did, can but humbly do him reverence.

Though we build monuments that do top the sky we could not in the slightest measure express the esteem that is due him and in which we hold him. Words can not express the praise due him nor the devotion the world owes him.

Proud, indeed, should the world be of so noble and worthy a man as Columbus, whose name is inscribed on every tablet of famous men of the world and mentioned in every history.

The growing sentiment in this country asks that this Congress give his name a place on the statute books of the land, and thus point the way to other States to enact legislation making Columbus Day a legal holiday.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee, the great achievements of this prince of discoverers have been so eloquently described and pictured here this morning by the preceding speakers that I hardly feel justified in attempting to narrate in my way this great event. I come here in the interests of various Italian daily and weekly newspapers in the city and State of New York, and represent as well a number of the members of the bar of the county who have suggested that I say to this committee that they, too, are in favor of the enactment into law of this proposed legislation.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it would be truly an inspiration if October 12 in each year could be devoted to some ceremony whereby the public may recognize in its own way the deed that is worthy of the thought of so great a man as Columbus. Citizens from every section of this land have, by means of communications, by means of petitions, by means of resolutions, communicated to the press in the city of New York an expression of their will that October 12 shall be devoted to this purpose. I ask, Mr. Chairman, in the name of these institutions, in the name of these papers which I represent, and in the names of many friends of this bill, that this committee make a favorable report thereon.

(The hearings were thereupon closed, with the thanks of the committee to the gentlemen who had appeared.)

ITALIAN-AMERICAN BARBERS POLITICAL LEAGUE,
New York, April 2, 1906.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day," and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus

first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the I. A. B. Political League Association, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. And be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

F. P. CAMBICOZ, *President*.
F. U. FRANCA, *Secretary*.

SOCIETÀ MORCONESI E SANNITI DI MUTUO SOCCORSO,
New York, 3 aprile 1906.

STIMATISSIMO SIG. CAV. ANTONIO ZUCCA:

Ho l' onore di partecipare alla S. V. Illmo. che questo consiglio d' amministrazione, in seduta ordinaria, ieri sera, ad unanimità deliberò di appoggiare la proposta, a che il Columbus Day, fosse dichiarata festa governativa, con ricorrenza il 12 ottobre di ogni anno.

Tanti ossequi, d' ordine,

G. D'ANDREA, *il Segretario*.

BALTIMORE, MD., 30 marzo 1906.

Cav. A. ZUCCA,

Presidente della Camera di Commercio Italiana, New York City.

EGREGIO SIGNORE: Essendo io presidente della Columbus Day Association di questa città, dopo avere letto l' articolo comparso nell' *Araldo Italiano* di New York, se permette vorrei farci le seguenti domande:

1. Formola della maniera di questa adesione.
2. Quanto tempo noi abbiamo per farla recapitare a Lei?
3. Se tutte le società esistenti in una città debbono unirsi e mandare una adesione sola? Siccome le società si riuniscano in differenti date mensili, e se non ci è qualche d' uno, che le spingie forsi per qualche d' una sarebbe troppo tardi.

Gradisca, Signore Cavaliere, i sentimenti della mia più grande stima, mi creda di Lei devotissimo vecchio amico,

CHAS. SIMONINI,
Presidente della Columbus Day Association.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN BARBERS POLITICAL LEAGUE,
New York, April 2, 1906.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the new world of America, shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the members of the Italian-American Barbers Political League Association, in meeting assembled, heartily endorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. And be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

F. P. CAMBRICO, *President*.
F. N. FRANCA, *Secretary*.

NEW YORK. April 13, 1906.

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find another resolution from the Society "Court Francesco Bentivegna, No. 441." Believe I will have a few more to send next week.

I remain, yours, respectfully.

ANT. ZUCCA.

COURT FRANCESCO BENTIVEGNA N. 441.

New York. 12 aprile 1906.

On. Cav. Uff. A. ZUCCA, 35 Broadway, City.

EGREGIO SIGNORE: La Corte F. Bentivegna N. 441 Foresters of America, nella seduta dell' 11 aprile, a deliberato "un voto si adesione al disegno di legge che l' On. William Sulzer a presentato al congresso per ottenere chi il giorno 12 ottobre, sotto il nome di 'Columbus Day' venga proclamato giorno di festa nazionale."

Ossequiandola mi creda,

LUDURY V. FERRARA, F. S.

SOCIETÀ ITALIANA CRISTOFORO COLOMBO, M. S.,

Waco, Tex., 12 aprile 1906.

Hon. W. SULZER, *Washington, D. C.*

EGREGIO SIGNORE: La Società Cristoforo Colombo del Waco, Tex., in una speciale adunanza, ad unanimità ha approvato il voto di adesione del Columbus Day.

L' assemblea tutta prega la E. V. a far in modo che il nostro desiderio venisse realizzato.

Con stima,

V. KEMENDO, *Presidente.*

J. MILANO, *Segretario.*

SOCIETÀ CITTADINI DI GIULIANA DI MUTUO SOCCORSO,

Brooklyn, N. Y., April 14, 1906.

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER.

DEAR SIR: Having read of the bill you are introducing in Congress, making October 12 a legal holiday, it affords me great pleasure in letting you know that the Società Cittadini di Giuliana is greatly in favor of it. At a meeting of the società held April 4 your bill was brought to a vote, the members unanimously favoring it. They informed me to let you know of it.

Hoping it becomes a law,

I remain, very respectfully,

A. MAGGIORE.

Secretary Società Cittadini di Giuliana.

SOCIETÀ BERSAGLIERI LAMARMORA DI MUTUO SOCCORSO.

PROTEZIONE ED ISTRUZIONE,

Rochester, N. Y., 11 aprile 1906.

Illmo. Signor Hon. WILLIAM SULZER.

House of Representatives. Washington, D. C.:

Mi onoro parteciparle che in assemblea generale tenuta per l' approvazione a festeggiare il Columbus Day al 12 ottobre, data della scoperta dell' America, questa società approvava e votava unanime a voler festeggiare solennemente il detto giorno.

Tanto in riscontro all' articolo inscritto sul giornale l' Araldo Italiano in data 3 corrente mese.

Sicuro di un esito favorevole a detta proposta, Le invio con i sensi di più alta stima gli ossequi della intera società, ed io ossequiandola la riverisco.

ANTONIO LIBUTTI, *Il Segretario.*

Resolutions adopted by the New York Fruit Exchange of the city of New York, at a meeting held on April 20, 1906.

Whereas it is eminently fitting that the fame of Christopher Columbus should receive national recognition, and that so great an event as the discovery of America should be celebrated by making the day a national holiday, therefore be it

Resolved, That the New York Fruit Exchange heartily endorse the bill introduced by Representative William Sulzer of New York, in the House of Representatives of the United States, providing that October 12 of each year be made a legal holiday, to be known as Columbus Day, and that the president of this exchange be directed to visit Washington and appear before the committee having the bill under consideration and urge a favorable report thereon.

VICTOR L. ZORN, *President*.
C. W. MAXFIELD, *Secretary*.

BALTIMORE, April 19, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor of the 18th instant, by which I note that a hearing upon your bill to make Columbus Day a national holiday will take place on April 28 at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

Arrangements have already been made for representation from Baltimore, and I will see that the members of this local committee are on hand promptly at the time set.

I beg to thank you for your advice in the matter.

Very truly, yours,

J. A. FECHTIG, Jr.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., 19 aprile 1906.

On. Sig. SULZER: Faccio plauso alla vostra nobile iniziativa per la promulgazione del Columbus Day e mi rallegro di tutto cuore per la vostra patriottica proposta.

Abbiatemi ora sempre per vostro devmo.,

ANTERO ZAGNONI,
Member of Italian Chamber of Commerce, New York.

SOCIETÀ ITALIANE UNITE,
Waterbury, Conn., 17 aprile 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Mi fa dovere comunicarvi che questo sodalizio, avuta conoscenza della vostra nobile idea, di far cioè dichiarare da cotesto congresso festa il Columbus Day (12 ottobre), unanimamente plaude alla vostra iniziativa e si associa con entusiasmo ad essa.

I soci tutti, superbi di appartenere alla patria di colui, che fu lo scopritore di queste terre ospitali, fanno voti a che la vostra proposta addivenga un fatto compiuto.

Con stima, devmo vostro,

D. CERULLI, *Segretario*.

SOCIETÀ DI MUTUO SOCCORSO FRA I CITTADINI DI CASTEL SARACENO.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the "Società di Mutuo Soccorso," in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. And be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

CARDIO GIOVINOZZI, *President*.
SERAFINO CAPUTO, *Secretary*.

NEW YORK, April 23, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 21st instant to hand. We will leave New York Friday night at 12 o'clock with the Pennsylvania Railroad, arriving in Washington on Saturday at 7 a. m., and we will go to the Metropolitan Hotel to have some breakfast, so that we can meet you in the House of Representatives at the appointed time.

Do you think it advisable to invite the Republican leader of the sixth assembly district, Mr. James March? Of course I will not do anything until I hear from you. I am also trying to induce the president of the New York Fruit Exchange, Mr. Victor Zorn, with whom you are already acquainted, to accompany us, as he is quite a good speaker.

I will have to pay all expenses, otherwise it is difficult to induce anyone to come, but this is nothing if only we succeed in our intent.

I have the resolutions passed by the Italian Chamber of Commerce and the New York Fruit Exchange, and I will send them to you or I will bring with me on Saturday.

Inclosed please find resolutions from the Società di Mutuo Soccorso.

I remain, yours sincerely,

ANT. ZUCCA.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., 25th.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER, *Washington, D. C.*

Italian colony of Schenectady called meeting this evening to send to your honor adesion for Columbus Day. Thanks, anticipating for the great civil work taken by your honor.

COMMITTEE.

CONGREGA DEL MONTE CARMELO,

447 East One hundred and fiftieth street, New York.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day," and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America, shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Mount Carmel Congregation Association, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

DOMENICO DI DARIO, *President*.
VICENZO BARBO, *Segretario*.

SOCIETÀ REDUCI PATRIE BATTAGLIE E MILITARI IN CONGEDO IN NEW YORK.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the ——— Association, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. And be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association, and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

REDUCI PATRIE BATTAGLIE E MILITARI IN CONGEDO.
G. CIAMIOS, *Il Presidente*,
PETER INGRASSIA, *Secretary*.

SOCIETÀ CRISTOFORO COLOMBO
New Haven, Conn., April 26, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

GENTLEMEN: It is our duty to inform you that the Society Cristoforo Colombo, of the M. Aid, at its special meeting of the 22d April, 1906, has passed resolution upon the proposal of the Columbia's day of the 12th October.

The society, with great enthusiasm, appreciated the noble and gentle proposition, hoping that it will be in favor of the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully,

SALVATORE BAKAMO,
Secretary.

MONESSEN, PA.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER, *Member of Congress.*

SIR: With the highest appreciation for your efforts to create a national holiday in commemoration of Christopher Columbus, we, the subscribers, members of the Italian Society of Mutual Aid of Monessen, would respectfully and most earnestly request that you use your efforts to have enacted a law whereby October 12 shall be decreed to be a national holiday and to be known as Columbus day.

Most respectfully, yours,

James V. Conti, Mariano Puleo, Aldo Donelli, Giacomo Limoy, Giuseppe Endrizzi, B. Cancelli, Pietro Capra, Altini Odovalnado, Gerace Antonio, Buzzella Antonio, Buglenti Marcello, Ronzoni Antonio, Antonio Canova, G. Badoja, E. Endrizzi, Dalloglio Augusto, Pietro Franceschin, Elijeo Coletti, Vivilani Benigno, Natale Brazzi, Valenzano Luigi, Angelo Franceschin, Rinaldi Benvenuto, Angelo Guatteri, A. Fioretto, Dino Caruzno, Sèverin Lauze, Luigi Caruso, Salvatore Petranusta, Filardi Salvatore, Filardi Giuseppe, Francisco Salvatore, Viviani Pietro, Jim Cavalli, Ernest Gerattro, Salvatore Possinello di Salvatore, Antonio Porrinello, Giuseppe Porrinello, Salvatore Porinello di Cristoforo, Giuseppe Filarde, Salvatore Filarde, Puleo Giuseppe, Joe Pierotti, Bernardo Arnoldi, Enrico Mideletti, Paolo Moroni, Roso Molpadrey, Germano Fanin, Tony Zaffoli, Luigi Boni, John Carnelli, Luigi Cecconi, Angelo Serastino, Viviani Giacomo, Petrancosto Giacomo, L. Barone, Luigi Chiavarini, Salvatore Crimi, Patsy Conti.

SOCIETÀ ABRUZZO CITRA, GABRIELE ROSSETTI DI MUTUO SOCCORSO,

New York, 26 Aprile, 1906.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October twelfth in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the ——— association, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association, and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

SOCIETÀ ABRUZZO CITRA, GABRIELE ROSSETTI,
GIUSEPPE CIANCIOSI, *Il Presidente*,
T. D'ALOISIO, *Il Segretario*.

SOCIETÀ MARINERIA ITALIANA DI MUTUO SOCCORSO,

New Haven, Conn., April 26, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER, *Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: It is our duty to inform you that the Società Marineria Italiana di Mutuo Soccorso of this city, at his special meeting of April 22, 1906, has passed resolution upon the proposal of the Columbus day of the 12th October.

The society, with great enthusiasm, appreciated the noble and gentle proposition, hoping that it will be in favor to the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully, yours,

VINCENZO EYBOILO, *President*.
PASQUALE CELOTTO, *Secretary*.

Whereas there has been presented in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States by the Hon. William J. Sulzer, a member thereof, a bill providing that the 12th day of October in each and every year, being the anniversary day of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, be made a legal public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, to all intents and purposes in the same manner as the first Monday in September in each year is now made by law a public and legal holiday; and

Whereas it is proper and fitting that October 12 of each year be made a public legal holiday, designated as Columbus Day, in recognition of the great services rendered to the world by the stalwart Genoese mariner who discovered America, and that the people of this country at large should on that day in some suitable manner commemorate that great event in the world's history; be it therefore

Resolved, That the Italian-American Democratic Union of Greater New York, in regular session assembled, does pledge itself to support said proposed legislation and to urge its enactment. And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be spread in full upon the minutes and a copy thereof remitted to the author of said bill, the committee in charge of such bill in Congress, and to the press.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC UNION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.
ANTONIO ZUCCA, *President*.

Attest:

JOHN J. FRESCHI, *Secretary*.

NEW YORK, April 6, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have mailed to you yesterday several resolutions which I have received from societies, and I now inclose one from the Società S. Mauro Forte di Mutuo Soccorso.

When you wish the delegation to come to Washington, kindly inform me a few days before so that I can make arrangements to leave here.

I remain, yours, respectfully,

ANT. ZUCCA.

SOCIETÀ S. MAURO FORTE DI MUTUO SOCCORSO,

New York, 4 aprile 1906.

Estratto del processo verbale della seduta ordinaria mensile della Società S. Mauro Forte di Mutuo Soccorso, tenuta nel locale sociale al No. 166 Ave. A in New York la sera di lunedì 2 aprile 1906:

"Proposta del socio Gerardo Gesualdi:

"Essendo venuto a conoscenza a mezzo della stampa italiana di New York che il Congressman Onorevole William Sulzer ha presentato alla Camera dei Rappresentanti degli Stati Uniti in Washington un disegno di legge per ottenere che il giorno 12 ottobre, sotto il nome di 'Columbus Day,' venga proclamato giorno di festa nazionale, propongo che la nostra società deliberi un voto di adesione al suddetto progetto di legge, affinché sia con ciò giustamente ed in eterno onorato il nome e la memoria del grande Italiano, primo scopritore ed apportatore della civiltà di cui a ragione si vanta la terra che ci ospita, la nostra attuale patria di adozione."

La proposta del Gesualdi appoggiata caldamente dal presidente del sodalizio, Signor Montesano, viene approvata con entusiasmo dall'intera assemblea.

V. MONTESANO, *il Presidente.*

G. GESUALDI, *Segretario.*

NEW YORK, April 24, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed please find about ten resolutions of different societies of Baltimore and New Orleans. I will probably have more to send in a few days.

I remain, yours, respectfully,

ANTONIO ZUCCA.

SOCIETÀ ITALIANA TIRO AL BERSAGLIO, GENERALE G. GARIBALDI,

New Orleans, La., 20 aprile 1906.

SIGNORE: La Società Italiana Tiro al Bersaglio, Generale Giuseppe Garibaldi, aderisce all'istanza presentata al Congresso perchè sia dichiarata festa nazionale il 12 ottobre data scoperta America.

VINCENZO MORECI, *Il Presidente.*

SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI MUTUA BENEFICENZA TERMINESE,

New Orleans, La., 21 aprile 1906.

SIGNORE: La Società Italiana di Mutua Beneficenza Termineze aderisce all'istanza presentata al Congresso perchè sia dichiarato festa nazionale il 12 ottobre data scoperta America.

VINCENZO MORECI, *Il Presidente.*

SOCIETÀ ITALIANA ARTISTICA OPERAIA DI MUTUO SOCCORSO, BALTIMORE, MD.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Artistica Operaia, in meeting assembled,

heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

JOSEPH BROCATO DE ELIA, *Secretary*.
SALVATORE MAGGIO, *President*.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Umberto Primo, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

PATRIOTTICA ASSOCIAZIONE ITALIANA, BALTIMORE, MD.,
PRIMO REGGIMENTO UMBERTO 1°, GENIO ROMA,
G. VIRAINY, *President*.
F. GAROFOLO, *Secretary*.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, herefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Unione Cefaludese, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

U. M. S., CEFALUDESE,
V. JOSEPH BANANCO, *President*.
GIOVAN MARIA LAUZA, *Secretary*.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day," and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Imera Croce Bianca, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association, and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer, and to the press of this city.

SOCIETÀ ITALIANA IMERA CROCE BIANCA, BALTIMORE, MD.
S. B. STAITTE, *Il Presidente*.
MONREALE.
J. SALMERI, *Il Segretario*.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day," and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Cristoforo Colombo, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association, and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

SOCIETÀ DI MUTUO SOCCORSO DI CRISTOFORO COLOMBO, BALTIMORE.
JOSEPH ORLANDO, *Il Presidente*.
FRANK DENTE, *Il Segretario*.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Circolo Filodrammatico Italiano, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

CIRCOLO FILODRAMMATICO E DI LETTURA, BALTIMORE, MD.
S. VERDI, *President*.
G. CARALLABE, *Secretary*.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 of each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Jolanda Pleasure Club, in meeting assembled heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. .

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

JOLANDA PLEASURE CLUB, BALTIMORE, MD.
FRANCESCO GUERCIO, *President*.
S. CICERO, *Secretary*.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Columbus Day Association, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. And be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association, and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer, to all the Italian societies of Baltimore city, and to the press.

COLUMBUS DAY ASSOCIATION, BALTIMORE, MD.
CHAS. SIMONINI, *President*,
S. VERDI, *Segret.*

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Patrie Battaglie, in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus. And be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

1 SOCIETÀ ITALIANA REDUCI PATRIE BATTAGLIE, BALTIMORE, MD.,
BARTOLO MICELI, *Il Presidente*.
FRANK DENTE, *Il Segretario*.

VALLEY OF NEW YORK, April 28, 1906.

Honorable SULZER,
Congressman, Albany, N. Y.

SIR: With the greatest pleasure we have learned that you are preparing a bill to be introduced in the Congress in order to make the 12th of October of every year a legal holiday. "The Columbus Day" should really be consecrated to the memory of that great Genoese navigator. To honor those who have rendered history wonderful is the characteristic of civilized peoples. We feel confident that the country of George Washington, which leads the other nations of the world in free institutions in civilization, your bill, crowning, by so doing, all your efforts by a splendid, magnificent success.

In my name and in the name of Giordano Bruno Consistory, No. 66, the highest Masonic body in the United States composed of Italian members, accept

our best and sincere thanks for what you are accomplishing in honor of humanity and civilization.

I have the honor to be, yours, sir, respectfully,

JOSEPH CRISTOSI,
Commander in Chief.

SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI M. B. CRISTOFORO COLOMBO,
New Orleans, April 25, 1906.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday; therefore, be it

Resolved; That we, the members of the "Società Italiana di M. B. Cristoforo Colombo," in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of the great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus;

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and the copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

Attested:

G. PASSALACQUA, *President.*
F. SANSETTA, *Secretary.*

SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DI M. B. GIOVANI BERSAGLIERI,
New Orleans, La., April 25, 1906.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the "Giovani Bersaglieri Mutual Benevolent Association," in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus;

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association, and the copies of them be sent to the Hon. William Sulzer and the press of this city.

Attested:

A. PATORNO, *President.*
PAUL MONTELEPEE, *Secretary.*

[L' *Araldo Italiano*, New York City, April 7, 1906.]

PEL COLUMBUS DAY.

Il disegno di legge presentato al Congresso dall' On. Sulzer per ottenere che sotto il nome di Columbus Day la data del 12 ottobre, anniversario della scoperta dell' America, venga proclamata festa civile, sarà molto probabilmente discusso prima che il Congresso si aggiorni.

Così è stato promesso all' On. Sulzer dal Presidente del Comitato Giudiziario al quale il progetto è stato deferito. Appena la data di una pubblica discussione sul progetto verrà fissata dal Comitato, l' On. Sulzer ne sarà avvertito e quindi una delegazione di quelli che appoggiano tal misura potrà recarsi a Washington a perorare l' approvazione.

Le probabilità di passaggio della legge sono molte.

Lo stesso Presidente del Comitato è in simpatia col progetto e se l' agitazione verrà ben condotta, se gl' Italiani risponderanno degnamente ai nostri appelli, l' idea del Columbus Day sarà presto tradotta in atto.

Constatiamo con piacere che già son pervenute all' On. Sulzer numerose adesioni di Società, di privati e di giornali italiani.

I colleghi della stampa che appoggiano l' iniziativa del Columbus Day, faranno cosa utile ed opportuna mandando all' On. Sulzer copie segnate dei loro giornali contenenti articoli su quel soggetto.

Raccomandiamo inoltre alle Società Italiane di tutti gli Stati Uniti di indire speciali adunanze per deliberare quanto più presto sarà possibile un voto di adesione e d' approvazione e di comunicarlo all' indirizzo: Hon. William Sulzer, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Le Società di New York potranno far pervenire le loro adesioni allo stesso On. Sulzer oppure al Cav. Uff. Zucca al 35 Broadway ed al 235 West Street, New York.

[L' *Araldo Italiano*, New York, April 5, 1906.]

PEL COLUMBUS DAY.

L' Italian-American Democratic Union riunitasi martedì sera nella sua sede ai numeri 181-183 Worth St. approvava la seguente deliberazione:

Considerando che dall' On. William J. Sulzer, membro della Camera dei Rappresentanti nel Congresso degli Stati Uniti, è stato presentato alla stessa un progetto di legge perchè il dodicesimo giorno di ottobre di ogni anno, essendo l' anniversario della scoperta dell' America fatta da Cristoforo Colombo venga proclamato festa pubblica sotto il nome di Columbus Day allo stesso modo che ora il primo lunedì di settembre di ogni anno è considerato per legge festa pubblica e legale; e

Considerando opportuno e conveniente che il dodici ottobre di ogni anno sia proclamato festa pubblica sotto il nome di Columbus Day in riconoscimento dei grandi servizi resi al mondo dall' intrepido marinaio genovese che scoprì l' America, e che il popolo di questo paese commemori in modo degno quel grande evento storico;

Deliberiamo che l' Italian-American Democratic Union del Greater New York, riunita in sessione regolare, appoggia la proposta legge e ne sollecita l' approvazione. Ed inoltre

Deliberiamo che la presente deliberazione venga integralmente messa a verbale e che copia di essa venga spedita all' autore del detto progetto di legge, al Comitato del Congresso al quale esso è stato deferito, ed alla pubblica stampa.

(Firmati) ANTONIO ZUCCA, *Presidente*.
JOHN J. FRESCHI, *Segretario*.

[L' *Araldo Italiano*, March 30, 1906.]

PEL COLUMBUS DAY.

Raccomandiamo di nuovo alle nostre Società, di New York e di fuori, di riunirsi d'urgenza e deliberare un voto di adesione al disegno di legge che l'On. William Sulzer ha presentato al Congresso per ottenere che il giorno 12 ottobre, sotto il nome di "Columbus Day," venga proclamato giorno di festa nazionale.

Le deliberazioni delle società possono essere trasmesse direttamente all' On. Sulzer a Washington presso il Congresso o all' On. Cav. Uff. A. Zucca, 35 Broadway e 235 West street, New York City.

I privati possono inviare le loro adesioni agli stessi indirizzi.

PEL COLUMBUS DAY.

[L' *Araldo Italiano*, March 30, 1906.]

Raccomandiamo di nuovo alle nostre Società, di New York e di fuori, di riunirsi d'urgenza e deliberare un voto di adesione al disegno di legge che l'On. William Sulzer ha presentato al Congresso per ottenere che il giorno 12 ottobre, sotto il nome di "Columbus Day," venga proclamato giorno di festa nazionale.

Le deliberazioni delle società possono essere trasmesse direttamente all' On. Sulzer a Washington presso il Congresso o all' On. Cav. Uff. A. Zucca, 35 Broadway e 23 West street, New York City.

I privati possono inviare le loro adesioni agli stessi indirizzi.

[L'Opinion, Philadelphia, Pa., March 30, 1906.]

COLUMBUS DAY.

Il cav. uff. A. Zucca, presidente della Camera di Commercio Italiana, mi rimette copia del "bill" presentato dall' On. William Sulzer alla Camera dei Rappresentanti a Washington, per il Columbus Day.

Il "bill" che fu mandato al comitato di esame, stabilisce che un atto del Senato e della Camera dei Rappresentanti degli Stati Uniti proclami il 12 ottobre, giorno della scoperta d'America, festa legale sotto il nome di Columbus Day.

Il cav. Zucca prega le associazioni italiane a prendere delle pronte deliberazioni di plauso e di approvazione, allo scopo di prestare queste deliberazioni in modo solenne all' On. Sulzer, onde dare alla sua proposta il consenso unanime delle nostre associazioni.

Non havvi dubbio che tutti, associazioni e privati, manifesteranno la loro gioia e soddisfazione per la proposta dell' On. Sulzer.

Ciò detto, eccomi a dire qualche cosa che potrà servire all' Onorevole Sulzer ad ottenere più facilmente la vittoria.

Nei primi del 1903, ad iniziativa degli amici della Federazione Colombiana e del giornale "Unione" di Pueblo, Colo., i primi che iniziarono la campagna "Pro Columbus Day," l'On. E. W. Martin del South Dakota, presentava alla Camera dei Rappresentanti una legge uguale a quella presentata ora dall' On. Sulzer.

La legge non venne in discussione, ma la Federazione Colombiana ricevè formale promessa dall' On. George Sutherland, congressman dell' Utah, dall' On. Cyril R. Landis, congressman dell' Illinois, dall' On. J. C. Bell, congressman del Colorado e dagli Onorevoli A. S. Leng e Chas. F. Scott, congressmen per il Kansas, che la legge avrebbe avuto tutto il loro appoggio.

Veda un poco l' Onorevole Sulzer se questi signori sono ancora dello stesso parere.

Ricorderò anche che nel marzo del 1903, il Senato del Colorado, su proposta del Senatore W. C. Slawson, votava in mezzo al più grande entusiasmo e alle grida di: Viva Colombo! una mozione facente voti perchè il Congresso di Washington votasse la legge per il "Columbus Day."

Ricordo queste cose perchè è bene che tutti sappiano come la tenacia e la costanza dei fautori del "Columbus Day" ha ottenuto già diverse belle vittorie morali, preparanti, ne sono sicuro, quella finale e positiva che tutti attendono.

Apostolo fervente del "Columbus Day" nel momento in cui per la seconda volta alla Camera dei Rappresentanti si ricorda che Colombo non è ancora onorato come si deve, io penso alla gioia dei componenti la Federazione Colombiana delle Società Unite degli Stati Uniti, alla soddisfazione e all' orgoglio di Ettore Chiarioglione, nel vedere non dispersa l' opera loro patriottica e santa.

[Il Telegrafo, March 30, 1906.]

PEL COLUMBUS DAY.

Circa tre anni fa quando l' On. Fitzgerald, facendosi eco di un' agitazione promossa fra gl' Italiani, presento alla legislatura dello Stato di New York un progetto di legge tendente ad ottenere che, sotto il nome di Columbus Day, l' anniversario della scoperta dell' America venisse riconosciuto come festa ufficiale dello Stato, la Camera di Commercio Americana di New York fece serie rimostranze.

Essa allegava che le feste ufficiali sono fin troppo numerose e che non c' era bisogno di sanzionare con una legge un' altra perdita di tempo pel mondo degli affari.

Dal punto di vista di un consesso così pratico l' allegazione era giusta; ma è strano che essa non venisse fatta per tutti gli altri days più o meno importanti di cui è punteggiato l' anno ufficiale e che si aspettasse a far rimostranze proprio quando si trattava di onorare il primissimo padre di questa gran madre di genti civili che è l' America.

Comunque sia, cedendo alla raccomandazione della Camera di Commercio della nostra Metropoli, o ad altre particolari considerazioni, il Governatore d'allora, Odell, oppose il suo veto alle legge, già approvata dalla Legislatura.

Intanto nel Colorado, promotore il collega Ettore Chiariglione dell' "Unione" di Pueblo, l'agitazione intesa al medesimo scopo otteneva un pieno successo e la legislatura di quello Stato riconosceva come festa nazionale il 12 ottobre.

Non dubitiamo che lo stesso avvenga ben presto nel Massachusetts dove il movimento pel "Columbus Day" è strenuamente appoggiato nella legislatura dall' On. Scigliano, e nel nostro stesso Stato dove gli On. Fitzgerald e Salomon si preparano a ripresentare il progetto respinto tre anni fa.

Siamo ora lietissimi di apprendere che il Congressman On. William Sulzer, che degnamente rappresenta una gran parte della cittadinanza di New York in seno all' Assemblée Nazionale, ha presentato a quell' altissimo consesso, il giorno 26 corrente, un disegno di legge per ottenere che la data del 12 ottobre venga proclamata festa nazionale sotto il nome di "Columbus Day."

L'On. Sulzer ha in ciò il consenso e l'approvazione di tutti quegli Americani per i quali la gratitudine è eminente virtù civica, e di noi Italiani che desideriamo vedere col Columbus Day onorato il nome del Grande Genovese e ricordato annulamente l'evento che schiuse la via del più glorioso avvenire alla terra che ci ospita.

Ad assicurare l'approvazione del disegno di legge dell' On. Sulzer occorre, però, che tutti gli Italiani facciano pervenire la loro adesione al degno legislatore e nel più breve tempo possibile.

Il Cav. Uff. A. Zucca, Presidente della nostra Camera di Commercio, è incaricato di raccogliere queste adesioni trasmetterle all' On. Sulzer.

Per dar forma pratica ed efficace a questa civile manifestazione le nostre Società sono pregate di riunirsi in sessioni speciali, di deliberare un voto di adesione all' opera dell' On. Sulzer e di comunicarlo al Cav. Uff. A. Zucca all. in indirizzo della Camera di Commercio, 35 Broadway, od a quello del suo ufficio, 235 West street.

Ma, ripetiamo, bisogna agire con la massima possibile sollecitudine.

L' approvazione del disegno di legge dell' On. Sulzer ridonderà ad onore della nazione intera e del nostro rappresentante, e soprattutto ridonderà ad onore del nostro patriottismo che avrà contribuito efficacemente ad una meritoria opera di giustizia verso l' immortale navigatore al cui genio è dovuta la scoperta della nostra seconda patria.

PEL COLUMBUS DAY.

[L'Araldo Italiano. March 31, 1906.]

Un giornale metropolitano noto per la sobrietà e giustezza dei suoi commenti agli avvenimenti del giorno, riferendosi al disegno di legge presentato dall' On. Salomon alla legislatura dello Stato di New York pel Columbus day fa alcune obiezioni che possono essere sommarizzate come segue:

1.° Gli Americani non desiderano passare per adoratori di eroi e non amano le feste direttamente associate a personaggi più o meno illustri. 2.° Colombo è morto da molto tempo e il sentimento di personale obbligazione verso di lui non è molto vivo. 3.° Le feste sono per paesi festaiuoli (trasparente allusione all' Italia) e non per paesi dove si lavora.

Il rispondere a queste obiezioni non è un arduo compito.

Per la prima basta dire che la ripugnanza per le feste personali è giunta, in America, perfino a creare un Dewey Day, il che è tutto dire. La seconda, nel suo elegante cinismo, non farebbe onore alla gratitudine degli Americani nè al loro buonsenso perchè dimostrerebbe che non hanno il senso della proporzione istituendo indiretti paragoni fra nomi ed avvenimenti. In quanto alla terza, essa è basata su di un' erronea impressione che non regge ad un confronto di lunarii. Infatti le feste ufficiali italiane sono quattro solamente, mentre in America le feste statali sommano ad una trentina.

Inoltre vogliamo sperare che l' autorevole giornale metropolitano non supponga essere il Colorado, per esempio, uno Stato in cui si lavora meno che in qualche altro sol perchè quella legislatura ha legalizzato la festa colombiana.

Dimostrata, così, l' ingenuità delle obiezioni più comuni che si accampano in questi giorni contro il riconoscimento del 12 ottobre come festa ufficiale, ripetiamo ai nostri lettori—e specialmente alle nostre Società di New York e di fuori—che è loro dovere concorrere col loro appoggio morale ad ottenere l' approvazione, del disegno, di legge pel Columbus Day presentato al Congresso dall' On. Sulzer.

Come quest' appoggio debba concretarsi, l' abbiamo già detto :

Si riuniscano d' urgenza le società ed approvino un voto di adesione all' iniziativa dell' On. Sulzer.

Le deliberazioni vengano quindi trasmesse direttamente all' On. Sulzer a Washington presso il Congresso o all' On. Cav. Uff. A. Zucca, 35 Broadway e 235 West street, New York City.

I privati possono inviare le loro adesioni agli stessi indirizzi.

[L'Araldo Italiano, New York, March 30, 1906.]

PEL COLUMBUS DAY.

Circa tre anni fa quando l'On. Fitzgerald, facendosi eco di un' agitazione promossa fra gl' Italiani, presentò alla legislatura dello Stato di New York un progetto di legge tendente ad ottenere che, sotto il nome di Columbus Day, l'anniversario della scoperta dell' America, venisse riconosciuto come festa ufficiale dello Stato, la Camera di Commercio Americana di New York fece serie rimostranze.

Essa allegava che le feste ufficiali sono fin troppo numerose e che non c'era bisogno di sanzionare con una legge un' altra perdita di tempo pel mondo degli affari.

Dal punto di vista di un consenso così pratico l'allegazione era giusta ; ma è strano che essa non venisse fatta per tutti gli altri days più o meno importanti di cui è punteggiato l'anno ufficiale e che si aspettasse a far rimostranze proprio quando si trattava di onorare il primissimo padre di questa gran madre di genti civili che è l'America.

Comunque sia, cedendo alla raccomandazione della Camera di Commercio della nostra Metropoli, o ad altre particolari considerazioni, il Governatore d'allora, Odell, oppose il suo veto alla legge, già approvata dalla legislatura.

Intanto nel Colorado, promotore il collega Ettore Chiariglione dell' "Unione" di Pueblo, l'agitazione intesa al medesimo scopo otteneva un pieno successo e la legislatura di quello Stato riconosceva come festa nazionale il 12 ottobre.

Non dubitiamo che lo stesso avvenga ben presto nel Massachusetts dove il movimento pel "Columbus Day" è strenuamente appoggiato nella legislatura dall' On. Scigliano, e nel nostro stesso Stato dove gli On. Fitzgerald e Salomon si preparano a ripresentare il progetto respinto tre anni fa.

Siamo ora lietissimi di apprendere che il Congressman On. William Sulzer, che degnamente rappresenta una gran parte della cittadinanza di New York in seno all' Assemblea Nazionale, ha presentato a quell' altissimo Consesso, al giorno 26 corrente, un disegno di legge per ottenere che la data del 12 ottobre venga proclamata festa nazionale sotto il nome di Columbus Day.

L'On. Sulzer ha in ciò il consenso e l'approvazione di tutti quegli Americani per i quali la gratitudine è eminente virtù civica, e di noi Italiani che desideriamo vedere col Columbus Day onorato il nome del Grande Genovese e ricordato annualmente l'evento che schiuse la via del più glorioso avvenire alla terra che ci ospita.

Ad assicurare l' approvazione del disegno di legge dell' On. Sulzer occorre, però, che tutti gli Italiani facciano pervenire la loro adesione al degno legislatore e nel più breve tempo possibile.

Il Cav. Uff. A. Zucca, Presidente della nostra Camera di Commercio, è incaricato di raccogliere queste adesioni per trasmetterle all' On. Sulzer.

Per dar forma pratica ed efficace a questa civile manifestazione le nostre Società sono pregate di riunirsi in sessioni speciali, di deliberare un voto di adesione all' opera dell' On. Sulzer e di comunicarlo al Cav. Uff. A. Zucca all' indirizzo della Camera di Commercio, 35 Broadway, od a quello del suo ufficio, 235 West street.

Ma, ripetiamo, bisogna agire con la massima possibile sollecitudine.

L' approvazione del disegno di legge dell' On. Sulzer ridonderà ad onore della nazione intera e del nostro rappresentante, e soprattutto ridonderà ad onore del nostro patriottismo che avrà contribuito efficacemente ad una meritoria opera di giustizia verso l' immortale navigatore al cui genio è dovuta la scoperta della nostra seconda patria.

[L' Araldo Italiano, New York, April 4, 1906.]

PEL COLUMBUS DAY.

Mentre ogni giorno si erigono monumenti ad uomini la cui fama non oltrepassa i limiti di una Provincia o di uno Stato, pochi individui che fanno consistere la propria superiorità di spirito nel menomare la vera e reale grandezza di uomini il cui nome sopravvive ai secoli, vorrebbero far credere che in una Repubblica dove si tollera un monumento a Federico il Grande, non sia conveniente il riconoscere come festa ufficiale la data della scoperta di questo paese.

Qualcuno di questi spiriti superiori ha insinuato che il Columbus Day sarebbe una concessione fatta agli Italiani e che come tale deve essere sconsigliato perchè nessun favoritismo di nazionalità o di raa deve entrare negli atti della vita pubblica americana.

Ora questo specioso pretesto potrebbe trovare una giustificazione qualora al Congresso Nazionale od alla legislatura di uno Stato venisse chiesto il riconoscimento ufficiale della data di nascita o di morte di Cristoforo Colombo.

Ma il disegno di legge presentato in questi giorni al Congresso dall' On. William Sulzer mira ad ottenere che venga riconosciuta come festa civile la data della scoperta di questo grande paese, e questo riconoscimento, risolvendosi in una glorificazione dell' avvenimento che aprì alla giovane America la via della civiltà e della grandezza, nulla ha in sè che possa offendere il sentimento nazionale degli Americani.

Se la logica e la gratitudine prevalessero non dovremmo essere noi soli a propugnare la doverosa manifestazione, ma da un capo all' altro degli Stati Uniti tutta la nazione dovrebbe levar la voce a reclamarla dai corpi legislativi.

Certo il Columbus Day nulla aggiungerà alla gloria di Colombo, ma aggiungerà onore al popolo americano che dimostrerà di saper ricordare degnamente il primo gran padre della sua patria.

Ad ogni modo, qualunque sia per essere l'attitudine degli Americani rispetto al progetto di legge Sulzer, noi Italiani manterranno viva l'agitazione, cercheremo con tutti i nostri sforzi di secondare l'iniziativa dell' On. Sulzer per ottenere l'approvazione del progetto, e faremo ciò con la coscienza di compiere un dovere.

Rinnoviamo quindi alle Società italiane di tutti gli Stati la raccomandazione di indire speciali adunanze per deliberare quanto più presto sarà possibile un voto di adesione e d'approvazione e di comunicarlo all' indirizzo: Hon. William Sulzer, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Le Società di New York potranno far pervenire le loro adesioni allo stesso On. Sulzer oppure al Cav. Uff. Zucca al 35 Broadway ed al 235 West street, New York.

[Bollettino Della Sera, March 30, 1906, New York.]

PER LA SCUOLA VERDI.

Pubblichiamo volentieri la lettera che ci scrivono i signori Cincotta e Marchetti:

ROXBURY, MASS., 26 Marzo. 1906.

Egredi Signori del Bollettino della Sera:

Plaudendo alla nobile iniziativa da voi presa per l' erezione di una Scuola Industriale a beneficio di noi italiani vi rimettiamo la modesta lista di sottoscrizioni da noi raccolta!

E' sempre con animo ben lieto che noi e i nostri amici cerchiamo, nella cerchia modesta delle nostre forze, di cooperarci pel bene comune e pel buon nome d' Italia e perciò abbiamo con piacere raccolto il vostro appello.

Nella speranza che l' opera patriottica da voi intrapresa abbia presto la sua pratica attuazione e con la certezza che nessuno dei nostri connazionali voglia esimersi dal contribuire a questa che sarà un vero vantaggio per la nostra numerosa colonia, vi preghiamo accettare i nostri distinti saluti.

CINCOTTA E MARCHETTI.

	Centisimi.
Cincotta e Marchetti.....	50
Garilo Francesco.....	25
Giuseppe Conti.....	25
Vasquez Giovanni.....	25
Giunta Pasquale.....	25
Boccalino Cuono.....	25
Aquila Giovanni.....	25
Russo Giuseppe.....	25
Santospirito Lorenzo.....	25
Russo Felice.....	25
Conti Domenico.....	10
Corrado Domenico.....	10
Caravaglio Gaetano.....	10
Totale.....	\$3. 05
Somma precedente.....	4, 397. 23
Totale a tutt' oggi.....	4, 400. 28

Piu, interessi fino al 15 febbraio, 1906, \$387.07.

PER IL COLUMBUS DAY.

Il Cav. Uff. Sig. A. Zucca ci dirige la seguente lettera:
Bollettino della Sera, City:

NEW YORK, 28 marzo 1906.

Egregio Sig. F. FRUGONE.

Le acchiudo copia del bill proposto dall' Onor. William Sulzer nella Camera dei Deputati in Washington.

Con esso si propone che il 12 ottobre, Anniversario della scoperta d' America, sia riconosciuto giorno festivo negli Stati Uniti.

Il bill è stato passato alla commissione parlamentare per l'apposito esame, ed al tempo stesso ne fu disposta la pubblicazione.

Sarebbe ora opportuno ché il bill fosse appoggiato favorevolmente dall' Opinione pubblica, e non credo necessario fare rilevare a Lei l' importanza dell' appoggio della stampa in generale e del suo pregievole giornale in particolare, onde riunire una quantità di deliberati e risoluzioni, dalle varie Associazioni Italiane, che possono essere a me inviati onde possa a tempo opportuno presentarli io personalmente o con delegazione al comitato.

Ellà comprende bene l' importanza della vittoria per noi Italiani di vedere confermata quale giorno festivo per tutti gli abitanti degli Stati Uniti, la ricorrenza della scoperta dell' America fatta da un Italiano, Cristoforo Colombo.

Distinti saluti,

ANTONIO ZUCCA.

* * * * *

Si, comprendiamo bene, benissimo l' importanza per noi italiani, specialmente, della legge presentata al Congresso federale: la comprendiamo tanto, e tanto vi si volse a torno da lungo tempo il nostro pensiero, che arrivammo a formulare dei giudizi poco benevoli verso tutti i legislatori che si succedettero al Campidoglio di Washington, i quali non sentirono il dovere di decretare che fosse giorno di festa civile il 12 di ottobre, ad onoranda commemorazione del glorioso figure, inventore di un mondo, per lunghissimo ordine di secoli, rimasto ignorato da tutto il rimanente del globo terraqueo.

E' quindi, cosa superflua ed oziosa che noi ci dichiariamo propensi e ardentemente volenterosi di aderire alla richiesta espressa nella lettera del Cav. Uff. Zucca; ed a conseguire il troppo lungamente atteso trionfo di una giusta causa non lesineremo mai il nostro appoggio, non verranno mai meno le nostre calde esortazioni a chiunque può contribuire a raggiungere il nobile fine.

Senonchè ci sembra che siasi errato nella scelta della strada che deve condurci alla metà desiderata; e lo sbaglio, secondo il nostro ragionamento, risiede nell' aver fatto presentare al Parlamento di Washington il disegno di legge da un deputato democratico, invece che da uno di parte repubblicana, che è quella che dispone della maggioranza dei voti.

Si obietterà che, trattandosi di una legge dove non entra affatto il sentimento

politico, nè impegua in nulla il bilancio, non c'è da temere la ragion di partito, e che, per conseguenza, da questo lato, non vi debbono esser ostacoli da sormontare, fortezze da espugnare.

A questa obiezione rispondiamo che in ogni assemblea deliberativa, divisa in due o più parti, la così detta disciplina di partito costringe i deliberanti ad obbedire ad una data parola d'ordine, a votare cecamente contro una proposta del partito avverso. E quando anche—come nel caso nostro—questa parola d'ordine non si facesse udire, e si lasciasse piena libertà di voto, subentrerebbero in alcuni la indifferenza e la tiepidezza tanto da non impegnarli a sostenere o a contrariare una data proposta, la quale, perciò a punto, potrebbe o entrare in porto, o andar sepolta in un naufragio.

Poichè la maggioranza al Parlamento federale è repubblicana, bisognava che il disegno di legge per il "Columbus day" fosse presentato da un membro di questo partito, ed allora gran parte delle difficoltà sarebbero state rimosse fino dal bel principio, specialmente se si fosse pensato ad incaricare di ciò qualche eminente personaggio di una delle due Camere federali.

Nè a questo soltanto si doveva pensare; ma sarebbe stato utile—e forse, in parte, si è sempre a tempo per farlo—impegnare preventivamente qualche leader parlamentare, ed anche far motto della cosa anche alla Casa Bianca.

Speriamo che i nostri timori siano infondati, che il dubbio di un fiasco venga dissipato dalla potenza democratica, e dalla concorde agitazione degli italiani, come la nebbia l sorgere di un sole fulgente, e che la mossa giusta e giustificata, il tentativo per avere la festa di Colombo, come si ha quella di Lincoln, non si risolvano in altro che in una manovra di partito, non siano altro che un colpo da maestro del pilota che governa la barca elettorale democratica italiana.

ITALIAN BENEVOLENT SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF COLUMBUS LEGION,

New York, 11 aprile 1906.

Sciogliendo la riserva contenuta nella mia precedente lettera, accludo copia della deliberazione presa da questo sodalizio in data 2 corrente mese, giusta la formula da Lei favoritami.

Un esemplare è stato spedito a 200 società italiane con la circolare di cui pure Le alligo copia con preghiera alla S. V. di leggerla, perchè da essa circolare si rilevano i voti espressi al riguardo dai rappresentanti delle società unite allorchè si è commemorato ogni anno la scoperta di America in onore di Colombo, ad iniziativa di questa istituzione.

Al plauso ed ai desideri di cui sopra è parola, La prego di gradire la mia personale adesione e quella della famiglia numerosa che rappresento, con l'augurio del trionfo il quale, rappresentando la vittoria della giustizia, costituirebbe senza dubbio una delle tante glorie in favore degli italiani fra i quali Lei primo, perchè italianissimo di origine, di mente e di cuore.

Mi creda di Lei devotissimo.

FRANCISCO SISCA, *Segretario.*

Illmo. Cav. Uff. ANTONIO ZUCCA,
235-237 West street, City.

SOCIETÀ DI BENEFICENZA LEGIONE DEI FIGLI DI COLOMBO.

New York, 2 aprile 1906.

EGREGIO SIGNORE: Tenuti presenti i voti espressi dai rappresentanti delle società italiane unite in tutte le commemorazioni della scoperta di America, e specie quelli risultanti dai relativi verbali in data 29 settembre 1902, 20 settembre 1903, 10 ottobre 1904 e 17 novembre 1905, tendenti ad ottenere che il 12 ottobre di ogni anno sia legalmente dichiarato giorno festivo nazionale, partecipandovi il plauso deliberato oggi al riguardo da questa società in onore del Congressman On. William Sulzer pel suo progetto di legge presentato sotto il nome di Columbus Day, preghiamo la benemerita società della quale voi fate parte interessante di aderire al più presto a sì nobile, giusta e patriottica proposta il cui trionfo rappresenterà senza dubbio la gloria del nome italiano in America.

Per la uniformità delle deliberazioni da parte dei diversi sodalizi, ci facciamo un pregio alligare una formula che ci è stata inviata dall' On. Cav. Antonio

Zucca, acciò possa essere spedita allo stesso Signor Zucca del No. 235 West st., New York, ovvero direttamente al prefato On. Sulzer, House of Representatives, in Washington, dopo essere stata regolarmente firmata dal presidente e dal segretario, senza dimenticare di approvare il nome del sodalizio.

Gradite cordiali ossequi,

VITO CONTESSA, *Presidente.*
FRANCESCO SISCA, *Segretario.*

ITALIAN BENEVOLENT SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF COLUMBUS LEGION, NEW YORK.

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by the Hon. William Sulzer, Representative from the Tenth Congressional district of New York, a bill to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day, and

Whereas it is fitting that the momentous day on which Christopher Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World of America shall be marked and commemorated by a public holiday, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Italian Benevolent Society of the Sons of Columbus Legion in meeting assembled, heartily indorse the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, and express to him our appreciation of his recognition of the honor due by America and all mankind to the memory of that great and fearless Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

And be it further resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of our association and that copies of them be sent to the Honorable William Sulzer and to the press of this city.

VITO CANTASSA.
FRANCESCO SISCO.

SOCIETÀ GIOVANNI DI POTENZA,
New York, 11 aprile 1906.

Detta società riunitasi, in assemblea ordinaria, la sera del 4 aprile 1906. Unanime deliberava di far piena adesione al progetto di legge presentato dall'onorevole Sulzer (Columbus Day). E fa voto che detto progetto venga approvato.

ROCCO OFFIDO,
il Presidente, 20 Stone street.
POMPONIO GIOVANNI,
il Segr. di Corr., 25 Oak street.

Case sociale, 76 James street, New York.

SOCIETÀ GALILEO GALILEI,
Milwaukee, Wis., 8 aprile 1906.

Si è riunita per deliberare e riconoscere il giorno 12 ottobre la nascita di Colombo festa nazionale.

D. PIERI, *Segretario.*

The Regulation of Railway Mileage Ticket Books.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 19264) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the House of Representatives at this time to the merits and the urgent necessity for the enactment into law of my bill (H. R. 18712) "to regulate the price of mileage tickets on railway transportation companies doing an interstate-commerce business, and for other purposes," introduced by me on April 27, 1906. The bill is a very short one, and I send it to the Clerk's desk and ask to have it read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to regulate the price of mileage tickets on railway transportation companies doing an interstate-commerce business, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That all railway companies doing an interstate-commerce business shall sell mileage books, good for 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 5,000 miles, on their respective lines or constituent lines or connecting lines, traversing two or more States or Territories of the United States, at a price not exceeding 2 cents per mile for said mileage books, between points of destination over any railway line or branches or connecting lines of the same doing an interstate-commerce business, which said mileage books shall be good to pay for transportation between all places of destination on said railway lines, and that said mileage books shall be in the denominations hereinbefore designated, and shall be for sale by all of said railway companies at their respective offices or branch offices to any person or persons desiring to purchase the same; and said mileage books shall be good until used, and transferable by the purchaser or owner of the same; and that said mileage books shall be made out for the number of miles herein specified, namely, 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 5,000 miles; and the said mileage books shall be so printed that they shall contain mileage tickets or coupons for 1 mile, 5 miles, 10 miles, 25 miles, 50 miles, and 100 miles, in order that the conductor taking up said tickets or coupons can take up the exact fare per mile, not exceeding 2 cents a mile, for the distance traveled by the passenger or passengers between destinations.

Sec. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any railway transportation company doing an interstate-commerce business to charge or collect for said mileage books more than 2 cents per mile or to give any rebate thereon; that is to say, to charge for said mileage more than 2 cents per mile, with the understanding, express or implied, that the excess over said 2 cents per mile shall be returned to the purchaser when the purchaser shall return to the railway transportation company the said mileage book with the mileage tickets therein contained used, the purpose of this act being that said railway companies doing an interstate-commerce business shall sell mileage tickets at a flat and specified rate not exceeding 2 cents per mile between all points of destination on their respective lines or branch lines or connecting lines, without any overcharge to be subsequently returned to the purchaser in the nature of a rebate.

Sec. 3. That any violation of this act by any railway transportation company doing an interstate-commerce business in and between any of the States or Territories of the United States shall be a misdemeanor, and the officers and directors of said railway transportation company guilty of the same shall be punishable by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding \$10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. That this act shall take effect immediately.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the bill speaks for itself, and was introduced by me to prevent the practice now in vogue by some of the railway companies of the country of charging the purchaser of mileage-ticket books an extra \$10 for each book, with the understanding that this excess sum of \$10 is to be refunded on the return of the covers of the book. The great trunk lines of the country, as a general thing, now sell a thousand-mile ticket book, which is not interchangeable and nontransferable, for \$20, being 2 cents a mile, but they charge an excess of \$10, making \$30 in all, and withhold the \$10 until the covers of the book are returned. This is unjust and practically amounts to the taking of private property without just compensation or due process of law. There is no just warrant for this inequitable discrimination and it must be abolished.

It is generally known that the commercial travelers of the country have been fighting for years for a transferable mileage-ticket book that shall be good on all lines of railroads doing an interstate-commerce business. These commercial travelers are among our most deserving and industrious citizens. They are entitled to their rights and to fair treatment from the railroads. They are honest, earnest, sincere, and intelligent business men compelled by their occupations to travel from one end of the country to the other during all seasons of the year. They must be economical to make both ends meet. They are delightful companions and welcome always wherever they go. They are an essential part of our business and commercial life. I know them and I like them. I am now, always have been, and always will be their friend. They are entitled to our protection against unjust discriminations by the transportation corporations of the land, and we should legislate immediately to prevent further imposition on them by the railways, who take their money by these excess rates and give them nothing for it in return. I am with them in their demand for an interchangeable mileage-ticket book, to be good on all railroads, and good until used, and to be transferable from one person to another. This is only just and honest and fair, and sooner or later they will win their fight because they are right.

Now, I want to say that I am reliably informed that the Pennsylvania Railroad alone sells on an average 18,000 of these

1,000-mile ticket books every month, and charges the purchasers of them \$20 for each book, being at the rate of 2 cents a mile, and an excess of \$10, which the railroad company agrees to refund whenever the covers are returned; but often the covers of the books are lost and can not be returned, and the \$10 is a total loss to the purchaser and a clear gain to the railroad company. Whenever the railway companies sell a thousand-mile ticket book at the rate of 2 cents a mile it is simply a fair excursion or wholesale rate and a good stroke of business on the part of the railway company, because they get \$20 cash in advance, and they should not be permitted to limit the use of the ticket by unjust and unreasonable requirements nor to discriminate by an excess charge of \$10. To do so is nothing more nor less than extortion. My bill will effectually remedy this gross imposition on the traveling public, and I sincerely hope the bill will soon be reported to the House and passed. This legislation is just as important to the passengers on interstate commerce transportation corporations as the railway rate bill is to the shippers of the country, and both bills must soon become laws in the interest of the people.

The number of these mileage books sold monthly by the railroads of the country is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 50,000, and the railroads, by this excess charge of \$10 for each one of these books, takes out of the pockets of the people a sum of money without any warrant whatever equal to about \$500,000 a month, or at least \$6,000,000 a year, and the interest on this great sum, to say nothing of other losses, amounts to over \$300,000 annually. This is an outrageous imposition on the traveling public, and practically amounts to the confiscation of their property; and I say this extortion must cease in the interest of justice and honesty and fair play to the commercial and other travelers of the country.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the bill which has just been read at the Clerk's desk, if it is enacted into law, will immediately stop and effectually end any railroad company making the purchaser of a mileage ticket book pay more for it than the actual price, and the bill provides that in no case shall the actual price be more than the rate of 2 cents per mile. It can be as much less as the railway company wants to charge. It seems to me that it would be a good business proposition for these railroads to sell these mileage books as provided by the terms of this bill. The railway statistics of the country demonstrate most conclusively that on the great trunk lines 2 cents a mile is ample compensation for railway tickets, and no railroad in the country doing an interstate-commerce business should be permitted to charge the traveling public more than 2 cents a mile. Many of the railroads, according to their own statements of their passenger earnings, can afford to carry the people to-day at a rate much less than 2 cents a mile. I believe the railroads exist for the benefit of the people and not the people for the benefit of the railroads. I would not confiscate the property of either. But, sir, whenever the railroads of the country—the great trunk lines doing an interstate-commerce business—become oppressive, unjust, and tyrannical in any particular direction it is the duty of Congress, having jurisdiction in the matter, to correct the abuse and enact necessary laws to remedy the evil.

It will be observed that my bill provides that these mileage ticket books are to be interchangeable and transferable and shall be good until used. The purchaser of one of these mileage ticket books will not sell it if he wants to use it himself, neither will he transfer it to another; and if he does not need it himself, why should he not have the right to sell it or transfer it to another or lend it to a member of his family? It is his property; he has paid for it, and paid all that it is worth, and he should be allowed to use it as he sees fit, or to dispose of it in case he has no further use for it.

The railway company loses nothing through the use of a railway mileage ticket book by some person other than the purchaser. It costs no more to transport one man than it does to carry another; and from a merely common-sense point of view it would seem to me to be good business judgment for the railway companies to promote the transfer of these mileage ticket books rather than to oppose their transfer, for the reason that the more the availability of such books is extended the more rapidly the transportation which they accommodate will be consumed. [Applause.]

Now, sir, that is all I desire to say at this inopportune time concerning this important bill. My purpose in presenting this matter to the House to-day is to get printed in the Record the full text of the bill and to briefly give the reasons why, in my opinion, it should speedily be enacted into law. It was necessary to do this because I am informed at the Clerk's office that copies of the bill can no longer be procured. The popular demand for copies of this bill from people all over the country has exceeded anything I have every known before, and I have been unable to comply with half the requests I have received since the bill was introduced.

Mr. Chairman, this morning the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom the bill was referred, were good enough to grant me a courteous hearing on this measure. I appeared before the committee and urged an early favorable report for substantially the same reasons I have voiced here. I believe the committee will report the bill favorably at a very near day. I believe the committee is aware of the popular demand for, and the urgent necessity of legislation of this character, and I indulge the hope—shared in by so many worthy citizens—that the bill will soon be reported favorably and passed before this session of Congress adjourns. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record in connection with my remarks some data in favor of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting certain data. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, May 1, 1906.

HON. WM. SULZER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Commercial travelers' organizations throughout the country fought for a long time for an interchangeable mileage book good on all railroads.

Commercial travelers have to travel on many railroads, and to get their transportation at 2 cents a mile they had to buy a 1,000-mile book from each road over which they traveled, costing \$20 each, filling

their pockets with books and wrapping up a good deal of money. They made a fight through their various organizations for an interchangeable mileage book to be good on all railroads. After a great struggle the Trunk Line Mileage Bureau finally concluded to sell a 1,000-mile book good on their roads for \$30, with the understanding that the extra \$10 would be refunded on return of the cover.

George W. Boyd, general passenger agent Pennsylvania Railroad Company, stated in a letter, dated February 5, 1906, to a commercial traveler friend of mine, S. M. Williams, of Pittsburg, that the Pennsylvania Railroad sells on an average of 18,000 of \$30 mileage books per month, which shows the vast number who travel and are being imposed upon by this system of mileage issued under the \$10 contract by the Trunk Line Mileage Bureau. The amount of commercial-traveler money now held by the railroads because of this is conservatively estimated to be:

Trunk Lines Association-----	\$450,000
Central Passenger Association-----	1,500,000
Pennsylvania Railroad, Pittsburg-----	350,000
Total -----	2,300,000

The interest on which, at current rates, would be nearly \$70,000.

When the railroad companies sell a 1,000-mile book at \$20 it is simply a fair excursion or wholesale rate, and whenever they sell a 1,000-mile book at that rate it is a good stroke of business. They get paid \$20 cash in advance. Then, why should they throw around it requirements that, in the estimation of the majority of the people who travel, are unreasonable and not required by many large railroads operating under just the same conditions as the Pennsylvania Railroad, Erie Railroad, Delaware and Lackawanna Railroad, etc.? The interchangeable mileage ticket was urgently requested by committees representing various traveling salesmen's associations, but in granting this mileage ticket these railroads tacked on the conditions regarding the \$10 excess and forfeiture of books in case of theft or loss. The Trunk Line Mileage Bureau claim they were compelled to throw these safeguards around their mileage contracts requiring a deposit of \$10, but railroads such as the New York Central, New York, New Haven and Hartford; Boston and Albany; Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg, and Philadelphia and Reading do not find it necessary.

I believe your bill will effectually remedy the existing evil and imposition by doing away with this \$10 excess payment, whereby thousands of dollars are withheld from the pockets of commercial travelers for the use of illegal pooling combinations.

Yours, faithfully,

WILLIAM HOGE.

NEW YORK COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS AND BUYERS' CLUB,
18 West Twenty-seventh Street, May 15, 1906.

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have noted with a great deal of interest and pleasure the efforts you are putting forth toward securing for the commercial travelers of the United States an interchangeable mileage book at a flat rate of \$20 per 1,000 miles. The traveling men of this country, who do so much toward upbuilding its commercial interests, and especially toward the prosperity and dividend-paying power of the railroads, are certainly entitled to this consideration at the hands of the railroad management.

We feel that in you we have a champion who will surely bring about some actual results so that these longed-for benefits will accrue to the commercial travelers, as we believe they so thoroughly deserve. We write this not only to pledge you our hearty support in this effort, but also to ask that you will kindly advise us as to what progress the matter is making in your hands and also as to whether there is any specific thing which we can do to further it along so that it may become an actual fact at an early date.

Again thanking you cordially for your interest and awaiting a reply at your earliest convenience, we are,

Very sincerely, yours,

COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS AND BUYERS' CLUB,
By EDWARD W. TINGE, *Secretary*.

HEADQUARTERS COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS' LEAGUE,
New York, May 17, 1906.

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In behalf of the Commercial Travelers' League of the city of New York, I desire to express my sincere thanks

to you for the introduction of your bill, known as "H. R. 18712." Your bill has created the proper sentiment among traveling men throughout the State, and they take pleasure in indorsing your bill in every town and hamlet where business calls them.

In the event of it being necessary for the representative of the C. T. L. to appear before the Congressional committee in charge of your bill, to urge its passage, we would be pleased to go to Washington for that purpose and have a delegation accompany us.

Thanking you for the important favor of the introduction of this bill and assuring you of our appreciation for your efforts in our behalf, we remain,

Yours, very sincerely,

FERDINAND ZIEGEL, *President.*

342 Manhattan avenue, City.

P. S.—Will you kindly forward to me as many copies of the bill as you can spare?

—
TURPENE MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
Philadelphia, May 17, 1906.

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: As a member of the T. P. A. of Pennsylvania, I wish to congratulate you upon the stand you have taken in the interest of the traveling men of this great country. Bill No. 18712 will undoubtedly prove to be one of the greatest benefits to the traveling public. Again congratulating you on the good you have done, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

ALBERT RIGGALL.

—
THE EAGLE WHITE LEAD COMPANY,
Philadelphia, May 17, 1906.

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on bill 18712, which I hope will prove a success and be numbered among one of our laws. This bill has the indorsement of myself and all the traveling men with whom I come in contact.

Very truly, yours,

T. E. BANNAN.

—
CINCINNATI VARNISH COMPANY,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 17, 1906.

Hon. WILLIAM SULZER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Permit me, on behalf of the T. P. A. of Pennsylvania, to thank you for the kind interest you have taken on behalf of the traveling man. At our State convention on May 5 we had the inclosed resolution unanimously passed. If there is any way in which the writer can be of any service to you, you have only to name same, and if you will drop me a line at any time I shall be only too happy to do all in my power to assist you in your good work.

I should appreciate as many copies of the bill as you could conveniently spare, as we propose to make a strong fight in all our commercial bodies looking toward the support of Pennsylvania's delegation to Congress for this bill.

Very truly, yours,

FRED. H. MACINTIRE.

[Resolution.]

Whereas Representative SULZER, Member of Congress from New York, has caused to be introduced in the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., House bill 18712, known as the Sulzer bill: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Pennsylvania Division, T. P. A. of A., in annual convention assembled, heartily indorse said bill and instruct its delegates to the national convention at Buffalo, to be held June next, to aid and promote its adoption by the national association; and be it

Further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to every Member of Congress in the State of Pennsylvania, urging their support of bill No. 18712, and that every post secretary be furnished with a copy of this resolution, and the posts be asked to take action in this matter, and every member of Pennsylvania Division is urged to solicit the vote of his Congressman for this measure.

URGES TRAVELERS TO WORK FOR SULZER MILEAGE BILL—NEW YORK SILK MERCHANT CALLS RAILROADS' TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL SALESMEN AT PRESENT UNJUST.

EDITOR NEW YORK COMMERCIAL.

SIR: I see by your paper that Representative WILLIAM SULZER has introduced a bill regulating the price of mileage tickets on railways doing an interstate-commerce business. This is a matter in which commercial travelers, buyers and their employers, as well as all other people who travel considerably on railway trains and who buy mileage books, are greatly interested.

Commercial travelers' organizations throughout the country fought for a long time for an interchangeable mileage book, good on all railroads. Commercial travelers have to travel on many railroads, and to get their transportation at 2 cents a mile they had to buy a 1,000-mile book from each road over which they traveled, costing \$20 each, filling their pockets with books and wrapping up a good deal of money. They made a fight through their various organizations for an interchangeable mileage book to be good on all railroads. After a great struggle the Trunk Line Mileage Bureau finally concluded to sell a 1,000-mile book good on their roads for \$30, with the understanding that the extra \$10 would be refunded on return of the cover.

George W. Boyd, general passenger agent of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, stated in a letter, dated February 5, 1906, to a commercial traveler friend of mine—S. M. Williams, of Pittsburg—that the Pennsylvania sells on an average 18,000 of \$30 mileage books a month, which shows the vast number who travel and are being imposed upon by this system of mileage issued under the \$10 contract by the Trunk Line Mileage Bureau. The amount of commercial traveler money now held by the railroads because of this is conservatively estimated to be—

Trunk Lines Association-----	\$450,000
Central Passenger Association-----	1,500,000
Pennsylvania Railroad, Pittsburg-----	350,000
Total -----	2,300,000

The interest on this amount at current rates would be nearly \$70,000. When the railroad companies sell a 1,000-mile book at \$20, it is simply a fair excursion or wholesale rate, and whenever they sell a 1,000-mile book at that rate it is a good stroke of business; they get \$20 cash in advance. Then why should they throw around it requirements that in the estimation of the majority of the people who travel are unreasonable and not required by many large railroads operating under just the same conditions as the Pennsylvania, Erie, Lackawanna, and other roads?

The interchangeable mileage ticket was urgently requested by committees representing various traveling salesmen's associations, but in granting this mileage ticket these railroads tacked on the conditions regarding the \$10 excess, and forfeiture of books in case of theft or loss. The trunk-line mileage bureau claims it was compelled to throw these safeguards around the mileage contracts requiring a deposit of \$10, but railroads such as the New York Central, the New Haven, the Boston and Albany, the Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg, the Reading, do not find it necessary.

I travel selling goods, and the firm (Eastmond & Sinclair), of which I am a member, also employs commercial travelers. I am, therefore, in a position to understand how this bill of Mr. SULZER's is going to affect a great many thousands of business men. I think the traveling men's organizations all over the country ought to pass resolutions in favor of it.

A. H. EASTMOND.

NEW YORK, May 2, 1906.

[Editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.]

TO STOP THE MILEAGE-BOOK EXTORTION.

Every Pennsylvania Congressman will be expected by his constituents to do all he can to promote the passage of the bill which has been introduced by Representative SULZER, of New York, prohibiting railroad companies engaged in interstate transportation from charging more for the mileage books issued by them than a flat 2 cents per mile rate. It is the present practice of some of the roads, and notably of the Pennsylvania, to require the deposit of \$10 on every 1,000-mile book. This deposit is returned to the purchaser upon the surrender of the covers, provided that he has not allowed the use of the book by any third party. If he has been guilty of that enormity, the deposit is liable to forfeiture. The Sulzer bill changes all that. It not only

declares that no deposit shall be exacted, but it expressly provides that mileage books shall be transferable at the option of the purchaser.

This is no more than fair and just and reasonable and right. The railroad company loses nothing through the use of a mileage book by some person other than the buyer. It costs no more to transport one man than it does to carry another, and from a merely common-sense point of view it might be supposed that the companies would be more inclined to promote the transfer of mileage books than to oppose it, for the reason that the more the availability of such books is extended the more rapidly the transportation which they cover will be consumed. The owner of a mileage book is not going to lend it to anyone else when he expects to need it himself. He will only transfer it for use during a period when it would otherwise be idle, and thus the sale of the commodity in which the carrier deals is stimulated and increased. This is too plain for argument, and it is surprising to find the companies pursuing a course which is manifestly prejudicial to their own interests.

Either they make money out of the use of mileage books or they do not. If they do not, why they should issue them at all is unaccountable, seeing that the railroads never have been accused of doing business on a philanthropic basis; but if they do, then it stands to reason that the more rapidly these books are used up the better it is for them. Possibly the explanation of this anomaly is to be found in the circumstance that there would be no excuse for the \$10 deposit extortion if the books were transferable, and there is no doubt that this extortion is the source of considerable profit. The people who buy mileage books use them all the time. As soon as one book is exhausted they purchase another, and so the company is left in possession of the deposit continuously. In the aggregate these deposits amount to a considerable sum, on which the interest is so much clear gain.

The Sulzer bill ought to be enacted into law, and as it only applies to interstate commerce, it will be the duty of the legislature at its next session to establish a flat rate of 2 cents per mile throughout the State. That will settle the mileage-book question all right.

[Editorial from the Scranton Republican.]

A MILEAGE BOOK BILL.

Representative SULZER, of New York, has introduced a bill in the House "to regulate the price of mileage ticket transportation by companies doing an interstate-commerce business, and for other purposes." It provides that all such companies "shall sell mileage books, good for 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 5,000 miles, on their respective lines or connecting lines traversing two or more States of the United States, at a price not exceeding 2 cents per mile for said mileage books."

The bill further provides that such mileage books shall be good until used and shall be transferable—that is, may be lawfully sold by the purchaser, if for any reason he cares to dispose of the same to another. It also forbids any railway transportation company doing interstate-commerce business to collect for a mileage book more than 2 cents a mile or to give any rebate thereon—that is, no railway company may, as some of them are now doing, require the purchaser of a mileage book to deposit a sum largely in excess of the price of the book, the excess to be returned to him on presentation of the covers of the book after the mileage has been used.

The penalty clause of the bill provides that any violation of the act shall constitute a misdemeanor and that the officers and directors of the offending company may be punished by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by fine not exceeding \$10,000, or both if the court deems it best to punish to the limit of the law.

There are some good points about this bill. Certain railroads have given great offense to the traveling public by requiring extra deposits from all purchasers of mileage books and the abuse should be corrected. The railroads exist for the benefit of the people, not the people for the benefit of the railroads, and when the latter become too tyrannical in any particular direction it is entirely proper that Congress or any other legislative body having jurisdiction over the matter should correct the abuse by such enactments as may be necessary for that purpose.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. WILLIAM SULZER, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

MONDAY MORNING, February 5, 1906.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to proceed to advocate the bills introduced by me for Alaska.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Let me say that I am a little embarrassed in regard to two of the bills that I wanted to take up this morning. One of them is my Alaskan fisheries bill, on which the final report of the Department has not been returned to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that both you and Mr. Sulzer have introduced fisheries bills, and the committee desires to give both of you gentlemen a hearing.

Mr. CUSHMAN. It is difficult for me to go on, as the bill is partially from my own brain and partly the suggestions of the Department of Commerce and Labor. When the bill was finally introduced it was referred to the Department of Commerce and Labor, and it should be here this morning. I would like to have a chance to look over it when it comes. There is another bill of a somewhat similar nature, it being a bill to prohibit aliens from fishing in the waters of Alaska. We could very properly take that up in connection with the other fisheries bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I propose that, inasmuch as the report on your bill has not been received from the Department of Commerce and Labor, Mr. Sulzer be permitted to proceed with his bills. I feel confident any argument either of you gentlemen may make will contribute to the information on the subject.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I would be very glad to have Mr. Sulzer go on.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be entirely satisfactory to you?

Mr. CUSHMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, if the committee will pardon me for just a moment, I wish to make this suggestion, that the salmon fisheries bills, regarding the propagation and culture and protection of salmon and other fish in Alaska, be allowed to stand over until to-morrow morning, when Mr. Cushman and I will be here, and we can then take the matter up together and endeavor, if we can, to agree to a bill that will meet with the best judgment and approval of this committee. I am agreeable to almost anything that will result in accomplishing something for the lasting good of Alaska. I want the best bill we can write to protect the fish of Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. I have set aside to-morrow for consideration of railroad bills.

Mr. SULZER. Very well, then; I will ask that this fish matter be set down for next Wednesday morning.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I think that would be better if it would not impose on the committee.

Mr. SULZER. As a matter of fact, next Wednesday morning will suit me better, because I have an argument to make Tuesday morning

before the Committee on Claims in favor of my bill for the relief of the *Slocum* victims.

The CHAIRMAN. We will hear you next Wednesday morning.

Mr. SULZER. Very well. And if the committee will indulge me, I want to speak to you this morning on my bill to give Alaska Territorial government, and in case that bill should not pass Congress this session, then my bill giving Alaska a Delegate in the House of Representatives immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. In this connection, Mr. Sulzer, I want to call your attention to the bill which has passed the Senate, introduced by Senator Nelson.

Mr. SULZER. Yes, sir; I am aware of that, and I am coming to that matter in a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on the first day that this Fifty-ninth Congress convened, namely, on December 4, 1905, I introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 329, a bill providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the district of Alaska. This bill of mine is identical with the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator Nelson, of Minnesota. The bill is known as the "Nelson-Sulzer bill." Senator Nelson's bill has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Territories and it has just unanimously passed the Senate and is now, I believe, on the Speaker's desk or before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been referred to this committee.

Mr. SULZER. So much the better. I have conferred with Senator Nelson regarding the matter, and he has requested me to ask the committee to substitute his bill for my bill to-day, and I now ask that my bill remain in the committee and that the committee report in place of my bill Senator Nelson's bill. I do this to accelerate the passage of the bill, because this bill must pass and become a law this session to be operative. The two bills are absolutely identical, and they are known, as I said, as the "Nelson-Sulzer bill," providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the district of Alaska. I have no vanity in this matter. I want to accomplish results.

I have been to Alaska several times. I know the people of that country. I have talked with a great many people up there, and I know the conditions prevailing in Alaska, and I say—and I say it advisedly—that it is a disgrace to our Government, a crying shame, that the Congress of the United States does not respond to the continued and insistent demand of more than 50,000 virile, patriotic, liberty-loving American citizens of Alaska and give those people representation.

We have given representation to Porto Rico; we have given representation to the Hawaiian Islands; we have given representation to Arizona; but we have not given representation in Congress to Alaska, and Alaska is more entitled to representation on the floor of the House of Representatives than any of our outlying insular possessions. I think I voice the sentiment of more than 50,000 Alaskans—as good, and as brave, and as honest, and as industrious, and as patriotic American citizens as live in all this land—when I say that they are united in favor of Territorial government first, last, and all the time. That is the relief the people of Alaska want, and they will keep on

wanting it, and demanding it, and fighting for it until they get it. And they are right; they ought to have it. I am a friend of the people in Alaska—and in future as in the past, in Congress and out of Congress, I will do all I can to help them get their rights. It is a burning shame to our country that the good people up in Alaska are prevented from governing themselves; that they are deprived of local self-government; that they are just as destitute of home rule as the people in Siberia. It is an outrage on their manhood and their citizenship.

I intend at some future day, when it will be convenient to this committee, to again ask to have my bill providing for a Territorial government for Alaska reported favorably, and I shall keep on agitating the matter until I succeed, and I want action quickly in order that the bill shall get a place well up on the calendar of the House, and in due time be brought up for discussion.

I do not intend now to go into an elaborate discussion of the details of my bill for Territorial government. Suffice it to say at present that I prepared the bill very carefully several years ago, taking as a form the Territorial bills which have been passed by Congress providing for Territorial governments for nine different Territories heretofore created in the United States. I have introduced and reintroduced the bill in three different Congresses, and the provisions of the bill are pretty familiar to the people of Alaska. But I must say at this time that my bill for a Territorial government for Alaska has been approved by nine-tenths of the newspapers of Alaska, and I will submit some of these editorials to the committee. It has also been approved by the Republican convention held in 1904 in Juneau to elect delegates to the Republican national convention at Chicago. My bill was unanimously indorsed by that convention, and it was also subsequently unanimously indorsed by the convention held in Juneau in 1904 to elect delegates to the Democratic convention held at St. Louis. It was recently indorsed in a convention at Seattle, to which delegates were sent from every town, city, and post-office in Alaska. That was a representative convention—one of the most representative conventions ever held—and they took up that bill and indorsed it. And I say Alaska should have Territorial government, and I will never rest until she has this inestimable privilege and blessing.

The CHAIRMAN. Did that convention take up the question of coming to Washington?

Mr. SULZER. Yes, sir. Governor Swineford and others are here, and at some future time I shall ask that they be given an opportunity to be heard in favor of my bill for Territorial government. They all favor it. They all want it, and it is the only solution of the Alaskan problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they desire to be heard as to this delegate bill?

Mr. SULZER. That I do not know positively. I know that they are all in favor of a Territorial government—in fact, instructed for it.

Mr. LLOYD. Do you know the difference between your bill and the bill of Mr. Jones, of Washington?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; in a general way. There is considerable difference. A hasty inspection of them will show that. When I take up

for action, before this committee, my bill for a Territorial government for Alaska I shall make certain comparisons showing the difference between Mr. Jones's bill and mine. That is a matter, however, which I desire to take up at some subsequent time.

I want to say this to the committee this morning, as emphatically and as impressively as I can, that the real people of Alaska, the people who have gone there from every State in the Union, and who are there to stay, and to die, and to be buried there; the pioneers, the brave and sturdy men who are opening up the richest section of the American domain to-day, and pouring into the Treasury of the United States millions and millions of dollars every year, I want to say those people—and I speak for them, and they want me to speak for them—I say they want Territorial government, and they ought to have it, and they will never be satisfied until they get it; and we are doing them a greater injustice than the English Parliament ever did the Irish people when we deny them this American right—home rule.

Gentlemen, I was in Alaska all last summer and traveled much, and I made several speeches at different places where I sojourned, and I said to the Alaskans that I would keep on fighting for the proposition to give Alaska a Territorial government, and that I would "stand pat" on it. [Laughter.] But I went further, and said to them that I doubted whether I would succeed in getting my bill for Territorial government through Congress at this session to give the people of Alaska Territorial government, and that as an old, experienced legislator of seventeen years, I realized that every forward movement in legislation was in the nature of a compromise, and that if necessary I was willing to compromise to this extent—and only to this extent—that I would confer with Senator Nelson, who has been to Alaska as a member of the commission from the United States Senate to look into conditions there, and if I could not get my bill for Territorial government passed I would aid the Senator to pass his bill giving Alaska a Delegate in Congress. The Senator's bill, I think, is a very fair bill, giving Alaska, in the first instance, a Delegate in the House of Representatives. I told the Alaskans that I would confer with Senator Nelson, and introduce a bill in the House identical with the bill the Senator would introduce in the Senate and try to get that through at the earliest possible day. I believe such a bill can pass, and if it passes I know that it will be signed by the President.

LLOYD. That bill is already here.

MR. SULZER. Yes; and I request its favorable report. I believe the people of Alaska, if this Delegate bill becomes a law ere this session adjourns, will select the best man they can, regardless of politics, to represent them in the House of Representatives, and he will come here and he will be heard; and I know his Macedonian cry from the time he is sworn in until the end of his term will be one continual demand, one long eloquent plea, for Territorial government; and if my bill is still pending I believe he will take up my bill, and I will be glad to give it to him and give all the honor and glory involved in it, and help him in every way I can to have it put on the statute books. I have no vanity in this matter. I want results. I am trying to do this for as fine a body of American citizens

as exists in any part of our domain. They are entitled to be a Territory and govern themselves.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, to-day, however, I stand here and say I am in favor of this bill of Senator Nelson's. It is identical with my bill, and I hope that my bill will be held in the committee and Senator Nelson's bill reported. It is a good bill so far as it goes, and I am so anxious to give Alaska representation in this Congress that I hope this committee will report the bill speedily and we will pass it through the House, and it will soon become a law, and the people of Alaska will be able to get ready to hold their first election in August next. This will be a step forward in the march of Alaska for Territorial government and statehood.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Do I understand you to say that you would like to have it reported to-day?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; if possible. Why not?

Mr. CUSHMAN. That is a very serious matter, from my standpoint. I am anxious to have this reported, but I think that we ought—

Mr. SULZER. I want to say to Brother Cushman that I am his friend, and I understand just where he stands, where I stand, in favor of doing something for the people of Alaska. I read your speech before the Alaskan Club last spring. It was a splendid oratorical effort, and it did you great credit. You are in favor of helping the people of Alaska in every way you can. I think I voice your sentiments, as well as mine, when I say that we should have no vanity in this matter at all. We are simply trying to accomplish results. You have a bill, which I have supported heretofore in every Congress since you introduced it, to give Alaska a Delegate in the House of Representatives. I think in justice to the people of Alaska that it would be advisable for both you and myself to shelve our Delegate bills and put through the Nelson bill, in order to accomplish the desired end, and do it quickly. If the Nelson bill is now reported it will pass the House and be a law before March 1 and Alaska will then get representation. That will be something.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, Alaska is a vast territory. It is more than one-sixth as large as the entire United States, and although magnificent distances are matters that the Alaskan seldom takes into consideration, still it is a serious matter that this committee ought to take into consideration, and the sooner we get this bill on the law books the quicker the people of Alaska can get ready with their election machinery to hold this election for a Delegate, and the date for the election is the first Tuesday in August. That is the best time to get around Alaska by water navigation, and the Delegate should be elected for the unexpired term of the Fifty-ninth Congress and for the full term of the Sixtieth Congress. If the bill does not so provide it should so provide. The bill says that the Delegate shall have the same rights and privileges as any other Delegate in the House of Representatives. It also provides that he shall receive the same salary and the same mileage as a Representative from the State of Washington, plus his actual traveling expenses from Alaska to the State of Washington. It is a simple but a comprehensive measure. Let us pass this bill quickly. It is the best thing to do at the present time, and it will pave the way for my Territorial bill, which is after all the consummation most devoutly wished by every

Alaskan. In the past I favored Mr. Cushman's Delegate bill, but I feel that we do not want to complicate matters now and cause delays that may be fatal by having his bill reported and sent over to the Senate and then a deadlock and no legislation.

I think that in order to accomplish something at the earliest possible moment, something that will help Alaska a step forward in the movement for Territorial government, we should pass Senator Nelson's bill as soon as possible and let the people up there elect their own representative to come down here and tell the House of Representatives exactly what the people up there want. I remember, Mr. Chairman, the first time I made a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives about the richness, the glory, and the greatness of Alaska. There was not another man in the House at that time who had ever been to Alaska, and many members thought I was a romancer and ought to be impaled in the Congressional history as a legislative Baron Munchausen. [Laughter.] In fact, every word I said at that time—ten years ago—was ultra conservative, but it was a prophecy, and it is true to-day. I then made statements which have since been corroborated over and over again by gentlemen who have appeared before this committee. I predict now—and I know whereof I speak—that Alaska in the next half century will produce more real wealth for the United States than any other State in the Union. I repeat what Admiral Vancouver said over a century ago, that the time will come, and it is now near at hand, when Alaska will support a population greater than that of the British Isles.

I predict that the time will come when the fertile fields of Alaska will furnish enough foodstuffs to sustain at least a population of 30,000,000 people. I assert that the time is at hand when Americans, instead of going abroad every year to get a change of atmosphere and to travel over the beaten tracks of effete civilization and view its insignificant glories, will go to Alaska—Alaska, the richest gem in the diadem of the American crown of States; Alaska, the wonderland of the world; Alaska, with unlimited scenery more beautiful than any other place on earth; Alaska, where the Almighty has painted in the art gallery of nature the most beautiful pictures the world will ever see; Alaska, with mountains incomparable; Alaska, with her myriad waterfalls, with her mighty rivers and her fertile fields, with her salubrious climate. Alaska is all this and more—a marvelous, indescribable wonderland. Americans go and see it for yourselves.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am afraid I am consuming too much of your valuable time, but if you will indulge me, I will continue. I never tire in dwelling on the present greatness and the future glory of Alaska, and I want to say to you that Alaska to-day is being opened up to settlement, and that her people are embarking in all kinds of industries—manufacturing, agriculture, mining—and her mineral resources are increasing at a rate which has been unprecedented in the history of the world. They are unlimited and richer than the dreams of avarice.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you and the members of this committee for what you have done and for what you are doing for Alaska, and to say that, as Representatives of the American people in Congress, you can not do any better work, you can not accomplish any more lasting benefit for this country, for its prosperity, for its

greatness, for its glory, and for its advantage than to give your time and attention to the wants of the vast district we call Alaska. We must respond to the demands of the Alaskan people for immediate legislation.

Mr. McKENNEY. In making the prediction about the large ultimate population of Alaska equaling or exceeding that of the British Isles, do you also predict changes in climatic conditions?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; there are great atmospheric changes going on. The changes in the climatic conditions in Alaska are so marvelous that they have thus far baffled the best scientists of the world. The climate is getting milder—no doubt due to the wonderful influence of the Japan current. I read, not long ago, a lecture delivered by a European scientist, in which he said that the Japan current, the greatest current known on earth, was changing the climatic conditions of the great Northwest. The people in Alaska realize it. We are learning more about Alaska every day, but no man can really do justice to her vast possibilities. But I am digressing, and I think I should confine myself this morning to what the people want in Alaska along the lines of legislation.

Alaska should have a Delegate in Congress at this time. In the first place there is a large and ever-increasing body of the best kind of American citizens in Alaska—pioneers who are willing to forego the ease and luxury of life in the States to develop that great country. The best blood of a nation flows in the veins of its pioneers. They are the advance guards of progress. They have opened up in Alaska a mine of wealth that the world never dreamed of. They have made Alaska commercially great, and for a decade have felt the need and practicability of a Delegate, and have been asking it from our hands for years. To-day, with a population doubled since the last census was taken and material financial interests increased in a still greater ratio, they ask you for this legislation.

The bill under consideration gives the people of Alaska the right to vote for and to elect a Delegate from Alaska to the House of Representatives who shall have the same rights and the same privileges in this body as a Delegate from any of the other Territories in the United States. Alaska is entitled to that. No one can deny it. Her people should be heard on this floor, and the Alaskans want to be heard here by some one of their own selection—competent to speak for them. Some one vested with authority who will be responsible to them for what he says on the floor of this House regarding Alaskan matters, and who will be responsible to Congress as well. No one familiar with the facts can doubt that Alaska is entitled to Delegate representation. It is a fundamental principle of our theory of government that none of our citizens shall be taxed without just representation, and the Alaskans have been taxed by the Federal Government for years and years without representation and without having a voice in their own internal affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I know something of Alaska. I know something about that vast domain. I know something about the sentiments of the people who live there, and I stand here and declare with the confident knowledge that I can not be successfully contradicted that the people of Alaska—the people who have gone there, and who have lived there for years, and who are bona fide residents of Alaska, and intend to stay there during the rest of their lives—I know what they

want, and I declare here that they want not only a representative in Congress, but they want Territorial government. They want the right that every other Territory in the Union has—the right to make their own laws, to levy their own taxes, to regulate their own internal affairs, and to spend the money gathered by the tax collector for their own use, for their own schools, for their own charitable institutions, for their own municipal affairs, and for their own peace and happiness. This is not asking too much in my opinion. It seems to me it is only fair and just and proper and right. Alaska has a population at the present time upward of 100,000 bona fide residents. It is true they are scattered over a vast domain of territory. But it is also true that they are an honest, brave, sober, manly, God-fearing people, who are of our kin, and who ought to be treated as American citizens.

I deprecate the remarks that have been made here, time and time again, that the inhabitants of Alaska are nomads, a sort of migratory people who go there simply to gather wealth and leave for the States just so soon as they have been able to get what they want. I deny these statements. I refute these allegations. I know they are not true. If some of the gentlemen who have made these unjust remarks and uncalled-for statements would only go to Alaska and see for themselves and talk to these people, they would come back here just as firmly convinced as I am that no people in all our land are more deserving of commendation for their patriotism and their law-abiding citizenship than the good, fearless, honest folk of Alaska. They are American citizens. They demand the rights of American citizens. They are entitled to all the rights of American citizens, and one of the fundamental rights of an American is the right to representation; the right to refuse to pay a dollar's tax to the Government unless he has a voice in its affairs; the right of local self-government; the right of petition; the right of assembly; the right to have a voice in the affairs of state and in making the laws that he must obey and that govern him and his fellow-citizens.

This Nelson-Sulzer bill to give Alaska a Delegate in Congress will not accomplish what the Alaskans demand; but, as I said, it is a step in the right direction, and I favor it because I believe it is the best we can get at the present time. They demand Territorial government, and knowing the facts as I do, I unhesitatingly say, and I defy successful refutation, that under all the circumstances Alaska is now, and long has been, entitled to Territorial government, and Congress ought to give it to the Alaskans without any more delay. Alaska is an anomaly in our sisterhood of States and Territories. It has been said here that Alaska is a Territory because a justice of the United States Supreme Court, writing an opinion about it, characterized it as such. No doubt it is a part of the territory of the United States, and perhaps that is what the distinguished jurist meant. Others here declare that Alaska is only a district, and I am inclined to concur in that view. If Alaska was a Territory in the Union, it would have all the rights of a Territory. It is not a Territory in the sense that Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma are Territories. It ought to be a Territory of our Government just the same as those other Territories and have all the rights and all the privileges that those Territories possess to-day; and the Alaskans will never be satisfied—never be contented—in my opinion, with any law that does not give them all the rights those other Territories possess. A Delegate to

this House from an unorganized Territory is a departure from all former precedent. In the absence of any form of local government, it may be impossible for a Delegate to properly represent the will and the wishes of the people, because of a lack of knowledge in the premises. I know that the people of Alaska are, in every point of view, abundantly capable of maintaining a local form of government, such as has always heretofore been accorded the Territories of the United States.

I do not fail to realize that this bill of Senator Nelson's is a step in the right direction; that it will accomplish something, and I favor it for that reason, indulging the hope that the time is not far distant when the Congress must give Alaska what Alaska wants—Territorial government. That is what the people up there want, and that is what they ought to have. It is right, and it is American. Alaska is just as much entitled to Territorial government to-day as Arizona or New Mexico. If we follow the precedents of the past, we can not withhold this boon from the people of Alaska.

In the light of all precedents and the experience of the past their population warrants it. For the benefit of those who know not, I insert a table which shows the population of 12 different States and Territories about the time they were given representation. Many of them had a Representative for some time before the enumeration had been made which brought forth these figures. Probably at the time of their receiving Delegate privileges this population did not average 3,000 whites in each Territory, and they had very little but agricultural matters to look after, with no comparison in commercial affairs to Alaska to-day. Here is an official table, which speaks for itself:

	Date of organization.	Population by census nearest date of organization.		
		Census.	White.	Total.
Arizona	Feb. 24, 1863	1870	9,581	9,658
Dakota—North and South	Mar. 2, 1861	1860	2,576	4,897
Idaho	Mar. 3, 1863	1870	10,618	14,999
Illinois	Feb. 8, 1809	1810	11,501	12,282
Indiana	May 7, 1800	1800	2,402	2,517
Michigan	Jan. 11, 1805	1810	4,618	4,762
Minnesota	Mar. 2, 1849	1850	6,936	6,977
Mississippi	Apr. 7, 1798	1800	4,448	7,900
Montana	May 26, 1864	1870	18,306	20,505
Nevada	Mar. 2, 1863	1860	6,812	6,857
Utah	Sept. 9, 1850	1850	11,380	11,380
Washington	Mar. 2, 1863	1860	11,138	11,594
Wyoming	July 23, 1868	1870	8,726	9,118
Alaska		1890	4,298	23,062
		1896	10,000	37,000

In 1890 the census of Alaska showed a population of 32,052. The census report for 1900 gives the population of Alaska as 63,592. When we consider the vast difficulty attendant upon the full and correct enumeration of population in thickly settled and more accessible districts, and how frequently the statement is made even in large cities that the census enumerators failed to properly enumerate and return a considerable per cent of the population, then how much more likely is it that in a district like Alaska, a vast expanse of territory with widely scattered towns, settlements, and mining camps, isolated

and separated, without railroad and telegraphic communications—how much more likely is it, I say, that where conditions like these exist that the census enumeration has not been full and complete.

I submit, in view of the foregoing, that it is not an extravagant estimate to place the present population of the Territory of Alaska upward of 100,000 people, and this population will undoubtedly increase in a greater ratio during the next few years than it has in the past.

The number of white people were less than 5,000 in 1890, with a very large portion of the remainder Indians and mixed. This great increase during the last ten years has not been caused by the births of natives. The Indian is rapidly passing away, so that the vast majority of the census population of 63,592 is beyond question white people who have emigrated from the States. These persons dominate the district, and in a short time, through the evolution of nature, the native Indian will have become a tradition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, by way of comparison, let me cite you a few cases: In the record of Territorial organizations we find that Nebraska, embracing all the district of country lying between the Missouri River and the Rocky Mountains and extending from the fortieth degree of latitude to the boundary line between the United States and Canada, was made a Territory in 1854, with a population too insignificant to be mentioned in the report of the preceding census, if, indeed, it were ascertainable. Yet we find that six years later it had attained a population of only 28,841—less than half that of Alaska in 1900. The Territory of Dakota, embracing what are now the States of North and South Dakota, was organized in 1861, having for two years previous maintained a provisional government of her own, although she was credited by the census of 1860 with a population of only 4,837, which, owing to the unsettled state of the country induced by the great civil war during that decade, increased to the extent of only 9,544 in the next succeeding ten years.

The capital was established at Yankton, in the extreme southeastern end of what is now the State of South Dakota, distant from the most remote settlements little, if any, less than 700 miles. There were no railroads or wagon roads, and the means of communication, except between Missouri River points, were not only more primitive than is now the case in Alaska, but at the same time far more expensive and dangerous. The country was a vast wilderness of treeless prairie, arid plains, and "bad lands," which, but for the building of subsidized railroads in advance of settlement, would never have become the home of any considerable number of white men. It was not then known to possess any of the great natural resources of which Alaska can now truthfully boast, and had the little handful of hardy pioneers who set up a government of their own in advance of Territorial organization been subjected to the operation of a policy similar to that which long ago obtained in the government of Alaska, and is still in vogue, it is not improbable that what are now two great and prosperous States of the Union would have remained to this day, figuratively speaking, a wilderness.

And so, sir, with many, if not all, of the Territories when they were first organized. The facts and the figures conclusively prove that Alaska is more entitled now to Territorial government than any of the Territories organized in the years gone by west of the Mississippi

River. Why should we deprive the citizens of Alaska of Territorial government? Is there a man here that can give any answer, except the logical answer that Alaska should become a Territory, with all the rights of a Territory?

Mr. Chairman, the district of Alaska is a vast domain lying in the extreme northwestern corner of the North American continent, on Bering Sea and the North Pacific. It comprises an area of about 577,390 statute square miles, with a seacoast of 26,000 miles, or nearly two and one-half times the seacoast of the balance of the United States. The district was acquired by purchase by the United States from Russia for \$7,200,000, and the boundaries as laid down in the treaty of cession of March 30, 1867, are: "Commencing from the southernmost point of the island called 'Prince of Wales Island,' which point lies in the parallel of 54° 40' north latitude, and between the one hundred and thirty-first and one hundred and thirty-third degrees of west longitude (meridian of Greenwich), the said line shall ascend to the north along the channel called Portland Canal as far as the point of the continent where it strikes the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude; from this last-mentioned point the line of demarcation shall follow the summit of the mountains situated parallel to the coast as far as the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude (of the same meridian), and finally from the said point of intersection the said meridian line of the one hundred and forty-first degree in its prolongation as far as the frozen ocean. With reference to the line of demarcation laid down in the preceding article, it is understood, first, that the island called 'Prince of Wales Island' shall belong wholly to Russia (now, by cession, to the United States); second, that whenever the summit of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast from the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the one hundred and forty-first degree of west longitude shall prove to be at the distance of more than 10 marine leagues from the ocean, the limit between the British possession and the line of coast which is to belong to Russia as above mentioned (that is to say, the limit of the possessions ceded by this convention) shall be formed by a line parallel to the winding of the coast, and which shall never exceed the distance of 10 marine leagues therefrom. The western limits, within which the territories and dominion conveyed are contained, passes through a point in Bering Straits on the parallel of 65 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, and its intersection by the meridian which passes midway between the island of Krusenstern, or Ignalook, and the island of Ratmanoff, or Noonarbook, and proceeds due north, without limitation, into the same frozen ocean. The same western limitation, beginning at the same initial point, proceeds thence in a course nearly southwest through Bering Straits and Bering Sea, so as to pass midway between the northwest point of the island of St. Lawrence and the southeast point of Cape Choukotski, to the meridian of 172 west longitude; thence from the intersection of that meridian, in a southwesterly direction, so as to pass midway between the island of Attou and the Copper Island of the Kormandorski couplet or group in the North Pacific Ocean, to the meridian of 193 degrees west longitude, so as to include in the territory conveyed the whole of the Aleutian Islands east of the meridian."

This is the vast domain of land ceded to the United States from Russia by the treaty in 1867, and when the American people paid Russia \$7,200,000 in gold coin for the Territory of Alaska a great outcry arose over the shameful extravagance of the Government. We had purchased, it was alleged by these fault-finders, a barren waste of snow and ice, an arctic region incapable of cultivation, whose only treasure was the seals that might be killed along its coast. The Administration had squandered the money of the people, and shrewd Russia was laughing in her sleeve over our simplicity!

It is possible that Russia did laugh in her sleeve over the simplicity that she imagined she had discovered, but it is certain that by this time she has changed her laugh to a sigh over the results of her own shortsightedness, for Alaska is recognized to-day as one of the most important gold-producing lands in the world. Her mines are the mecca of armies of prospectors, who go there to search for the precious ore that is the foundation of the money systems of the commercial world. She has returned to us in gold ore alone twenty times more than we paid Russia for her possession, and the sources of her golden treasure have as yet scarcely been scratched.

But it is not only in mineral wealth that Alaska promises to be a valuable Territory. That claim alone would be ample justification for the purchase of the arctic land, but she has other claims to add to this. Had anybody predicted, when the negotiation for her sale was conducted, that she could ever assume to be an agricultural country, he would have been regarded as a fit subject for treatment in a lunatic asylum. But we are progressing in knowledge. The Agricultural Department has been investigating, and it now announces that certain crops can be raised in Alaska at a good profit, and that great herds of cattle will thrive in her friendly climate.

Thus the purchase of Alaska promises to be one of the wisest things ever accomplished by our Government.

The great speech of Charles Sumner, delivered in the United States Senate in favor of the purchase of Alaska, in the light of to-day reads like a marvelous prophecy. Alaska ceased years ago to be called "Seward's folly." No amount of money could buy it from us to-day, and ultimately it will make three great States of the Union, and no doubt they will be called "Alaska," "Seward," and "Sumner." What a monument Alaska is to-day to the wisdom and far-sighted statesmanship of Charles Sumner and William H. Seward!

Mr. Chairman, another reason for a Delegate, which must impress itself with great force upon every member, is the fact that most of the relations with the Territory are direct with the General Government, and it is a tenet of our American creed that proper elective representation is the heritage of our citizenship. Whatever may have been the needs and the requirements of the limitations of Alaska in the past, I think the time has now arrived when it is not only feasible for its inhabitants to elect and have Delegate representation in the House of Representatives, but that its absolute necessity makes it a matter of right which we should heed by speedy action.

Alaska is a Territory whose prospects, resources, and commercial and political importance have heretofore been almost wholly unappreciated by most people. Even now, in the period of Alaska's marvelous development, the first thought of many persons is that a Delegate would be an experiment and an unnecessary expense, when, in fact,

of all our outlying Territories, Alaska is the one whose needs in this respect are paramount. Its isolation, distance, and peculiar surroundings as to climate, soil, resources, business and trade conditions, as well as population, render it impossible for Congress to fully recognize its wants and exigencies.

Alaska has an area of over 577,000 square miles. It would cover one-sixth of the territory of the United States proper. Its resources are simply wonderful; with its mines of gold, silver, copper, and coal, its mighty forests of merchantable timber, its rich wealth of furbearing animals, its enormous fisheries of seal, whale, salmon, cod, and halibut, and its already great and commanding commercial and political importance. And then, in connection with all this, comes the voice of a resistless and increasing flow of the most manly, virile, and hardy people in the world, who say, "Give us the protection of an interested and sympathetic government and we will not only support ourselves, but we will return direct into the United States Treasury annual revenues many times multiplying the amount of her investment by purchase."

At this point the expense of an election and the salary of a Delegate might well be considered. There may be inconveniences in an election on the frontier to which we are not accustomed, but that is the daily incident of the lives of pioneers. Tenacity of purpose and power of endurance are the two essential qualities that took them there. They have great interests to be looked after, and they say, "We want a man at Washington who knows us, our country, and our business to represent us and our interests."

It will be of some inconvenience and expense, but they are asking the privilege to incur whatever inconvenience it may be to hold an election. After that the only question for us to consider is: Is it reasonable and practicable? Those who seem to be most competent to judge say it is. As to the expense, they pay it. That is all there is to that.

Looking at the question in the light of the past, and by way of comparison with other portions of our country that have been made Territories in our Union, I believe that Alaska is more entitled to-day to Territorial government than seven-tenths of the other Territories that were organized. I am opposed, as a matter of right, and of justice, and of principle, to taxing the Alaskan people, gathering the taxes by a Federal tax collector, and, instead of giving the taxes to the people of Alaska for their own local purposes, depositing the money in the Federal Treasury and trying to govern Alaska from the Treasury Department or by the Congress, when nine-tenths of the men in Congress know absolutely nothing about the people up there, nor the country, either. But that is another story that will come up ere long, when we legislate to give Alaska Territorial government.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said here regarding the impossibility of holding an election in Alaska under this bill, should it become a law, and that its provisions would open the door to frauds on the ballot box. In my opinion, that conclusion is assumed, far-fetched, and without justification. If this bill should become a law in its present state, the election of a Delegate in Congress from Alaska would be just as honestly conducted as the election for a Representative in Congress in any State. And the Delegate elected

would be, no doubt, in the estimation of the Alaskans, or in the estimation of a majority of them, the most competent man they could find to send here to represent them, to get their rights, and to give Congress the information desired regarding legislation.

Let me say here, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate all that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Cushman] has done for Alaska. I understand the difficulties he has had to contend with. I am familiar with the obstacles which were put in his way. I know he has done the very best he could. He and I substantially agree regarding the immediate legislative needs of Alaska, but everything relating to Alaska can not be accomplished in one Congress. This bill of Senator Nelson's is a step in the right direction—a forward step toward Territorial government—and it is apparently the very best that we can do for the Alaskans until you pass my bill for Territorial government.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken of Alaskan resources in general terms as a reason for her recognition. Her mines of gold, silver, coal, and copper, already known to be great, are considered by many practically inexhaustible. She has the largest stamp mill in the world at Treadwell and bids fair to become the greatest gold-producing country on earth. The rapid development of the gold and silver mining industry of Alaska during the past four years is shown by the fact that the production has advanced from about \$6,000,000 in 1896 to about \$37,000,000 in 1905. This will increase, rather than diminish. At present the value of the precious metals lies chiefly in the gold placers of Nome and the interior regions. In the Nome region some 5,000 square miles are known to carry auriferous gravels, while in the Yukon Basin the area of auriferous gravels is probably several times as large. But it is not all placer mining. I believe that quartz mining is the kind in which Alaska will be preeminent in the near future and that even now it is affording the finest illustration that the world knows of profitable working of low-grade ore.

In the coast region of southeastern Alaska mining for gold, copper, and silver has been going on for a number of years. The development of this industry has been especially rapid since 1898, and it promises to become one of the most important mining districts of the country. The discovery of copper deposits in Alaska was made only six years ago, and hence the development is comparatively insignificant, though there are three districts in which valuable copper ores have been found. Mining has only been done in the one lying on the coast, and many tons of copper ore have been shipped from the Territory. The investigations of the past two years have shown, however, that there are unquestionably vast undeveloped copper deposits in at least three districts of Alaska. The coal of Alaska embraces lignites, bituminous coal, and some anthracite. The lignites are the most widely distributed of the three, and are the ones that have been largely prospected. Coal has been found in nearly every part of the district, both on the coast and in the interior. It has been mined at probably 100 different localities, but up to the present time only for local consumption, and the aggregate output, of which there are no authentic data available, would not amount to more than a few thousand tons a year. The coal is so widely distributed in the district that it must be regarded as one of its most important resources. It is a conservative estimate to place the area occupied by

the coal-bearing rocks at 100,000 square miles. Accurate statements can not be made as to the figures of the fish industry for the year 1905, but it can be said that it has been continually growing and is still in its infancy. More than one hundred varieties of food fish inhabit the Alaskan waters. The annual output of salmon alone will amount to more than \$11,000,000 at this time. The Territory alone can feed the fish-eating world. Alaska is a vast storehouse of unlimited and undeveloped wealth. No man can predict the extent of its future possibilities. We should be generous to Alaska—one of our greatest assets.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, no man can visit Alaska without being deeply impressed. Alaska is a wonderful country. No words can adequately describe it. It is the poor man's and the rich man's and the sportsman's paradise. It is a wonderland. The time, in my judgment, is at hand when this vast territory will be developed by American genius, American capital, and American enterprise, and, take my word for it, there will be no more prosperous section in all this progressive land for American brawn and American brain. Alaska is the place for the new settler—for the hustler—for the man who wants to go ahead and get on.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion, I favor Senator Nelson's bill, but in doing so I think I have made it clear that it is only a step forward in the right direction to the one boon the good people in Alaska demand, and that is Territorial government. Alaska wants this; Alaska must have it; Alaska with her population of nearly 100,000 people; Alaska with her splendid and invigorating climate; Alaska with her beautiful scenery, her magnificent distances, her towering snow-capped mountains, her majestic rivers, her fertile fields, her great industries of fish and furs and timber and agricultural possibilities; Alaska with her immense wealth in gold and copper and silver and lead and iron and coal—mineral wealth beyond the dreams of the most imaginative person in the world; Alaska with her brave and loyal and God-fearing and patriotic American citizens; Alaska with her churches and schools, her splendid institutions, her towns and villages; Alaska under the blue dome of the Union sky and in the shadow of the midnight sun; Alaska with her incomparable natural resources, with her great harbors and innumerable lakes and countless cascades; Alaska, in the name of all these and more, in the name of this generation and for the glory of our institutions, I demand for you the right of home rule, the inestimable fundamental American right of self-government—the right which you deserve and which ere long you shall have—the right of Territorial government.

THE RAILROAD RATE BILL
AND THE
GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF INTERSTATE
COMMON CARRIERS.

Just and reasonable railway rates and Government regulation of interstate commerce transportation companies is one of the most important questions now before the American people.

It will never be settled until it is settled right.

The highways of commerce, the avenues of industry, and the byways of trade must be open to all; and every shipper and every producer must be treated exactly alike—no midnight tariffs, no rebates, no discriminations, and no favoritism.

I am with the people in this fight. It is either Government regulation now or Government ownership hereafter. Let the railways take their choice.

The railroads must be the servants of the people, not their masters.

S P E E C H
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,
IN THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1906.

WASHINGTON.
1906.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12987) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It was not my intention to speak during the general debate on the pending measure, because I did not expect to get the time. However, by the courtesy of my friend from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], and quite unexpectedly, and I might say quite unpreparedly, I am afforded at this inopportune time the privilege of having my say on this all-important subject—a matter of much moment to all the people of the land, and affecting more or less intimately every section of our country—the question of the fixing of railway rates and the regulation of railroad and other transportation companies doing an interstate-commerce business in the United States.

I thank my friend from Georgia for his kindness in yielding to me his time, and I grasp the opportunity to use some of it, because I realize that if I did not take advantage of it now, I might not get a chance to speak to-morrow, when the debate on the bill will close; and I know by sad experience in this House that when the bill is to be read and is open for amendment, the day after to-morrow, there will be little or no debate permitted by those having this measure in charge. The bill, I am informed, is going to be rushed through the House—railroaded, as it were—regardless of its defects and its omissions and its incompleteness, and all amendments that Members desire to offer to strengthen the measure are to be quickly voted down, and the bill just as it came from the committee passed on to the tender mercies of the sacrifice Senate.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this matter of just and reasonable railroad rates and the governmental regulation of transportation companies doing an interstate-commerce business is one of the most important questions now before the American people. It is a live question, and no matter what we do now, or say now, you know and I know that it is here to stay until it is settled and settled right; and the problem never will be solved, and the issue will never down, until it is solved and settled for the best interest of all the people, and not in the interest of the selfish few.

I have given much careful study to this great subject. I know something about it. As a legislator trying my best to do my duty as I see it to all the people, I have given, and will con-

tinue to give, my very best efforts to help in the solution of the many problems we are called upon in these matters to determine, and they should be solved and determined by us in a spirit of fairness and equality and equity to all concerned. The highways of commerce, the avenues of industry, the byways of trade must be open to all; and every shipper and every producer must be treated exactly alike—no midnight tariffs, no rebates, no discriminations, and no favoritism. Equal rights to all and special privileges to none must be our watchword. [Applause.]

Now, sir, we all realize, I believe, that the great interstate-transportation agencies of our country are here to stay. They are essential to the business of the country. They can not be dispensed with nor destroyed. They are as fixed in our commercial life as the hours of the day, and as immutable in our industrial existence as the medium of exchange. Their mileage, and their equipment, and their wealth, and their power, and their influence will not diminish, but will increase more and more as the years come and go. They will continue to dominate the people if the people do not take action to control and to regulate them. The people of the country are aroused on this question. They will keep up the fight until it is won. You can beat the people to-day, you can deceive the people to-morrow, but the contest between right and wrong will go on, and sooner or later the people will win. I am with the people in this fight. It is either Government regulation now, or Government ownership hereafter—take your choice. [Applause.] As the President said on this subject in his message to the Congress in December, 1904, the Government must in increasing degree supervise and regulate the workings of the railways engaged in interstate commerce, and such increased supervision is the only alternative to an increase of the present evils on the one hand or a still more radical policy on the other.

I read not long ago, Mr. Chairman, that more than 80 per cent of the enormous railroad mileage which to-day gridirons the United States has been constructed since the civil war. We have over 215,000 miles of main railroad tracks, and the giant spider is still spreading its web of steel in every and all directions. And when we take into consideration the second, third, and fourth tracks, and sidings and terminals, the total foots up to nearly 300,000 miles of steel railroad tracks. Just think of that! Sufficient to go twelve times around the earth, or make a journey to the moon, if such a thing were possible, and have miles and miles to spare. We are indeed the greatest railroad country on earth, and will continue to be for a century to come. And if we pause to consider these marvelous figures and facts we must be impressed with the consciousness of the far-reaching power and effect of the railway influence in every line of human industry, and if we stop to analyze the volume of traffic handled we can not fail to realize how greatly the railway systems of our country enter into every phase of modern life.

In 1894 the railroads carried 638,000,000 tons of freight. In 1904 the figures more than doubled and reached the enormous total of 1,300,000,000 tons, with aggregate traffic earnings amounting to the enormous total of \$1,977,638,713. Last year they did a largely increased business, and the figures for 1906

will greatly exceed those of last year. In 1895 the records show that 527,421,000 passengers were carried; in 1904 the figures increased to 715,419,000, and when the reports for last year are at hand a much larger increase will be evident. The figures are bewildering and the facts as startling as they are astonishing; and the end is not yet.

To transport this vast number of passengers and gigantic amount of freight, including all varieties of foodstuffs, there were utilized 47,000 engines, 40,000 passenger cars, and 1,760,000 freight cars. In the operation of this great network of railways more than 1,250,000 men are directly employed, of which 52,000 are engine drivers, 55,000 firemen, 40,000 conductors, and 106,000 trainmen.

Of course, I know figures are usually uninteresting; but these figures are alive with human interest and full of flesh and blood activity, because they have to do not only with men and measures, but also with our national commercial life and our fundamental political and industrial institutions, which should safeguard the interests of all the people—but more often do not—and the home life, and the very existence of every man who works for a livelihood and earns his bread in the sweat of his face. [Applause.]

The rapid growth of our interstate common-carrier systems during the past quarter of a century has been simply marvelous, and the tremendous power they wield to-day in the intimate political and social and economic life of the country is truly inconceivable. The average man who rides on a railroad train in comfort and in luxury to a distant point has little conception of how the railway affects even the most intimate details of his existence. It is the power that dictates political conventions and makes nominations; that seats its well-paid lawyers in the courts of justice; that rules legislatures; that subsidizes the press; that dominates the National Congress, and that compels all of us, who must eat to maintain life, to pay the price for food which the big transportation interests fix directly or indirectly.

From a systematic investigation of existing conditions and a careful examination of governmental statistics, I fearlessly assert that the time is now at hand when the Government must take decisive action to regulate the great railways and great public transportation utilities of the country doing an interstate-commerce business, or they will ere long absolutely own and control the Government, and, through their great tentacles stretching out in every direction, they will be able to strangle competition, crush commercial endeavor, paralyze individual industrialism, and create the trust of all trusts and the monopoly of all monopolies.

These giant public utility transportation companies, traversing as they do every part of our national domain, are so vital a part of our complex industrial and economical and political life that their influence affects all things which go to make up our existence from day to day. I believe the people are just awakening to the consciousness of the real facts and the true situation, and in the study of the problem of the cost of living are finding out for themselves what recent economic writers have shown conclusively, and that is how the control and the power and the operation of railroads in this country overshadow every other factor of human existence.

And so, sir, knowing what I do about the facts and the conditions, and feeling as I do on this subject, I welcome remedial legislation, and shall favor any bill that will correct the abuses and remedy the evils incident to the subject-matter now under consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have carefully listened to the several clever speeches which have been delivered during the consideration of this measure. These brilliant forensic efforts, however, have failed, to my mind, to greatly illumine the subject or to impart to us very much valuable information. The time consumed in this debate, nevertheless, may not have been altogether wasted. Far from it; but it does seem to me strange that no two Members who have discussed the bill agree as to just what it means and as to just what it will do. In justice to myself I want to say that I do not agree with all that has been said in favor of the pending bill, and neither do I concur in all that has been said against the bill. We all appear to agree that the measure under consideration is not a perfect bill, intended to remedy every evil incident to the subject-matter. I do not think that even its distinguished author, for whose abilities in these matters I have great admiration, will seriously assert such a claim. Take this bill all in all, and the best that can be claimed for it, in my judgment, is that it is only a feeble effort to correct, in a doubtful way and to a limited degree, long-standing and patent and glaring abuses. Will the bill in its present shape even do this? I indulge the hope that it will to some extent, and if it does it will accomplish something; and believing that it will do some good, that it will remedy some evils, that it will correct some abuses, I shall vote for the bill; because with all its faults, with all its doubts, with all its omissions, with all its defects, I sincerely hope, and I want to honestly believe, that it is a step in the right direction—a legislative advance—a Congressional stride forward along right lines for the benefit of the many against the selfish interests of the few. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, there are some things about this bill that I do not like, and that I would change if I could have my way. I trust I will be forgiven by the sponsors of the bill if I indulge in a few criticisms of the measure, and, by way of suggestion, point out some glaring defects that should be cured by amendment to make the legislation more effective. The bill is a long one, but not a very comprehensive measure. It is an amendment to the interstate-commerce act, and purports to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The committee reporting the bill generously admit that in its preparation they were aided by the study of all the bills introduced by Members on this subject, and I want to say that I introduced at the beginning of this session what I believe to be a bill in the right direction, a bill that I seriously believe if enacted into law would, to a very great extent, effectually put a stop to railroad rebates and transportation discriminations. It is a short bill and a simple bill and a comprehensive bill. I do not know what consideration it received from the committee reporting the bill before us, but I do know that if it were a part of the law not a transportation company in the land would dare violate its provisions, because if it did the doors of a felon's jail would open to receive the offi-

clals of the company granting the rebate or discrimination, as well as the shipper receiving the gratuity and the favoritism. I have no vanity in the matter. I am seeking results for the best interests of all the people.

I do not claim perfection for my bill, like some of the zealous advocates of the pending bill claim for the measure now before us; but I do claim that my bill, to say the least, will go very far toward the serious solution of the many problems confronting us, and, in my opinion, have a beneficial tendency to correct present interstate transportation abuses. I believe that one of the greatest evils complained about in all these matters is the rebate abuse, by which an unjust discrimination is made between shippers and a rebate given back to one shipper, or to several shippers, which all the others must contribute to by paying an exorbitant rate.

This bill, sir, which I introduced (H. R. 8414) to amend the interstate-commerce act, and which is referred to in the report of the committee, would, in my opinion, effectually put a stop to rebates by making the rebate, if one is given, the maximum rate—that is to say, the rate paid minus the rebate would stand as the highest rate. If this bill were a law I am satisfied that no railroad or other transportation company could give a rebate without the fact being quickly found out by some shipper who was discriminated against, and just as soon as the fact of the rebate was established the Commission would fix the rate charged minus the rebate as the maximum rate. I believe if some provision of that kind were put in the bill now under consideration with a criminal penalty clause for its violation, it would effectually do away with rebates; but I would go further in this matter and make it a felony for any official connected with a railroad company, or other transportation system, doing an interstate commerce business, to grant a rebate, or for any shipper over the line to receive a rebate. If this were the law I am satisfied there would be no more rebates and that the evil would cease for all time to come. [Applause.]

We should make the punishment fit the crime, and if we do I believe there will be no more railroad rebates. Put in the bill a provision making the giving or the receiving of a rebate a criminal offense, punishable by a long term of imprisonment, and I say to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to the Members of this House, and I say to the country, that there would not be a railroad or interstate transportation company that would give a rebate, and no shipper would dare receive a rebate for love or money. [Applause.] You will never stop this iniquitous system of rebate favoritism and discrimination until you point to the prison doors. If this bill were intended to carry out the recommendations of the President it would contain a provision of this kind and the problem, so far as secret rebates are concerned, would be solved, and you never again would hear a shipper complain about a railroad or any other great public-utility transportation company doing an interstate-commerce business giving a secret rebate. [Applause.]

But here we have the unanimous report, the concentrated wisdom, of all the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and after laboring industriously for a year [laughter] they bring forth this remarkable document [laughter], this bill of twenty-six long pages of uncertain phrases,

that a Philadelphia lawyer can not comprehend [laughter], and which, I undertake to say, if placed on the statute books in its present shape and ultimately held to be constitutional, will not accomplish the purpose desired by the people of the country who have been complaining for the last quarter of a century against these unjust and unreasonable rates, these railroad favoritisms, and these interstate transportation discriminations. [Applause.]

I can demonstrate it, I think, in a very few words. If the gentlemen interested will glance at page 11 of this bill, section 15, they will find there what may aptly be termed the weak link in the chain of this measure. [Laughter.] On page 11, line 5, section 15, the bill prescribes the procedure of the Commission to fix and establish "a fair and just and reasonable rate." Then follows this significant language:

"That such order shall go into effect thirty days after notice to the carrier, and shall remain in force and be observed by the carrier unless"—mark the language. Here is what I believe to be the little joker in this bill [laughter]—"unless the same shall be suspended or modified or set aside by the Commission, or suspended or modified or set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction." Here is the committee's little black man. [Laughter.] This is the African in the railroad wood pile. [Laughter.] Can these words be misunderstood? I think not. I believe the railroads of the land and their lawyers are aware of their significance. I believe they know the import of this section, and I want to submit in all candor [laughter] to the railroad lawyers of the country how they interpret these words in the last line, to wit: "Or be suspended or set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction?" They know now what these words mean. I think I know what they mean, but the people who want railroad-rate legislation will find out later what they mean. [Laughter and applause.]

The word "suspended," if I am not mistaken, is used in this section of the bill advisedly, and it was put in there to baffle the efforts of those most anxious to accomplish something for the relief of the shippers of the country from unjust railroad rates and discriminations. I am aware that the word "suspended" has a well-known definition. [Laughter.] I am inclined to believe, however, that some of us just now fail to grasp the real significance of the word [laughter]; but if this bill becomes a law in its present shape those now crying at the doors of Congress for relief against railroad extortion will soon find out the fatality and the significance of the word "suspended." [Laughter.] Then some of us will be "suspended" by our trusting constituents. [Laughter.] The whole object sought by this remedial legislation may "hang" on this ominous word "suspended." [Laughter and applause.] And when the poor and injured shipper complains to the Interstate Commerce Commission created by this bill, consisting of seven members hereafter to be appointed for a term of seven years, at an annual salary of \$10,000—and I can imagine the struggle of the railroads to get just the right kind of men on this new commission—when the shipper makes his complaint, and the Commission fixes the rate—that is to say, makes its order establishing a fair and just and reasonable rate—I can see in my mind's eye the temporary joy of the shipper, until the railroad

lawyer rushes into court and during the thirty days allowed gets an injunction "suspending" the order of the Commission, and then what is the poor shipper to do? Why, go on paying the old railroad rate just the same as before. That is the way it will be done. [Applause.]

Let us, for the sake of argument, assume a case and follow it to its logical end. This bill in its present shape becomes a law. The new Commission, we will assume, has been appointed and a shipper who has been discriminated against for years, or who has been injured by rebates, who has been getting poorer and poorer while some other favored shipper, who has been profiting by his misfortunes, is getting richer and richer, makes complaint before the Commission and establishes that the rate he is paying is unjust. The Commission, on all the testimony adduced, is satisfied his complaint is justified and thereupon makes an order fixing a just and reasonable rate. That order will not go into effect for thirty days, and before it can go into effect—that is, during the thirty days, if the order is not satisfactory to the railroad company—the railroad lawyer will go into a court of "competent jurisdiction" and get an injunction "suspending" the order. Then the shipper will have to pay the old extortionate rate, and if he wants to fight the matter he must hire an experienced lawyer to carry the case up on appeal, and before the court of last resort adjudicates the matter between the railroad company and the shipper to see whether an injustice has been done or not, the shipper's business will be "suspended" [laughter] or in the hands of a receiver, and unless the shipper is a well-to-do and a shrewd and a sagacious and a pertinacious business man he will be "suspended" ere the final judgment of the case in the United States Supreme Court. [Great laughter and applause.]

With all due respect to the erudite authors and distinguished sponsors of the pending bill, I am inclined to think that this provision can be materially changed for the better by an amendment I shall suggest. If the bill becomes a law in its present shape, I am afraid it will accomplish very little of lasting benefit to the shippers and producers of the country, and will have a tendency to cause endless delay, and interminable litigation, and perhaps be the means of defeating the very object desired and sought to be accomplished. I am in earnest about this matter. I want to be fair. I do not want to create discord. I have no desire to find fault. I shall not be captious in my criticism of the pending bill. I am in favor of it, but I want to make it effectual—I want to make it really reach the evils involved and permanently cure them in the speediest possible way. [Applause.]

I am with the people in this railroad fight for justice. I have great personal regard for the distinguished chairman of the committee reporting this bill, but I would be false to myself and to this great cause if I did not honestly say that I believe that he and all the members of the committee could have presented to this House, under all the circumstances, a very much better bill, and I trust I will be pardoned if I am impelled by my sense of duty, and my conception of the gravity of the situation, and the importance of the subject-matter, to point out in the kindest way some of the serious defects, some of the glaring errors, and what I consider after all the vital weakness of the pending measure. [Applause.]

Hence, Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that I can not and I do not altogether agree with some of my colleagues who are congratulating themselves, and the committee, on the unanimity of the report in favor of this measure, and that the bill in its present shape is going to pass the House by a practically unanimous vote. It is true that the bill comes before the House with a most harmonious report; but a unanimous report from a committee on an important piece of legislation like this against great centralized corporate interests is not an evidence to my mind that the bill is a perfect measure and a complete remedy for existing evils. As an old and experienced legislator, having served for some time in two capitals, it is my opinion that in a great many instances where the report of a committee is unanimous in favor of a bill, especially a bill of such great magnitude as the one under consideration, which affects so many intrenched and powerful interests and which has met with so much opposition heretofore from the very interests affected—I say that the unanimity is susceptible to the construction that the bill is so drawn that somebody is going to be fooled. I do not know whether it will be those who want this legislation or those who do not want it, but I am inclined to think, that if this bill becomes a law in its present shape, that those who want it will be, to say the least, disappointed.

I believe that if the great interstate transportation companies were opposed to this bill their power and their influence would be so far-reaching that there would be a great deal more opposition to the bill than at present is evident. It is a fair assumption to believe that if the railroads of this country were opposed to this bill the measure would not meet with a practically unanimous vote in the House of Representatives. I do not want to go into details. It is unnecessary for me to elaborate the proposition. I have no desire to be a carping critic. Far be it from me to disturb the placid waters existing at present in this body. Of course I assume that the great transportation companies of the country have felt for some time that the demands of the people for the enforcement of the laws, for the abolition of rebates, and for more just and reasonable railway rates would have to be acceded to sooner or later, and perhaps they are willing to accept this weak and doubtful measure rather than run the risk of further arousing public indignation and the enactment of more drastic legislation to curb the power of these great interstate transportation companies.

Everyone familiar with the subject is aware of the fact that for years there have been secret rebates and unlawful discriminations by railroad companies and other transportation corporations to favored shippers. These discriminations and these favoritisms are criminal and must be stopped, and if the laws on the statute book now are not strong enough to put a stop to them, then we must make new laws rigid enough to put an end to them in this country forever. Whether this bill will stop them or not I do not now undertake to say, but I do hope that the bill will be materially amended ere it becomes a law, with the object of more effectually stopping them. I know of no greater injustice to the producers of our country than to have a transportation company give a rebate to one shipper at the expense of all the others. There should be no favoritism; the rate should be the same for all shippers and for all producers; equal

rates, equal rights, and equal opportunities for all should be the rule. But we know the history of the past, and we do know of many cases where one shipper has been favored at the expense of all the other shippers until the favored shipper controlled the product or the industry, drove out of business every competitor, and ultimately secured a complete monopoly.

If you will read the testimony which has been adduced in several investigations heretofore held at the instance of the Government you will readily comprehend the truth of this proposition. But I do not care at this time to go into details or to be too critical. I am an optimist and not a pessimist; I hope for the best; and I trust the bill will be materially amended and become a law and accomplish some good. I shall do my best to improve the bill by amendments, if they will be permitted; but I can not refrain now from telling what I actually believe and to voice my convictions and say that the bill in its present shape is not satisfactory to the real friends of Federal regulation. It is a good deal of a makeshift; it is weak; it is apologetic, and the railroads are not opposing it. That puts me on inquiry. The unanimity with which it is going through this House also lends color to the suspicion that the railway interests of the country see no danger in its wishy-washy provisions.

It looks to me as if the fight for a square deal from the railroads is far from won, and the friends of rate reform and governmental regulation of interstate transportation companies must keep up the fight and fight harder than ever. [Applause.]

It is apparent to me that if this bill were intended to compel the railroads to live up to the law now on the statute books, if it were a bill to force the transportation companies to give fair and just and reasonable rates to every producer and to every shipper, you would find these halls filled with railroad lawyers and transportation lobbyists protesting against the passage of the bill; and I am frank to say that the bill would not meet with so very little opposition. But I have not heard of a railroad protesting against the passage of this bill. I have yet to learn of a transportation company sending to the House objections to the enactment of this legislation; and I have not seen nor heard of a single railroad lawyer who has been sent here to argue against the progress of the bill; and so, as I say, I am inclined to be doubtful as to the effectiveness of the remedy proposed in the pending measure. [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; I always yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Would the gentleman from New York know a lobbyist when he saw one?

Mr. SULZER. Well, that depends. There are lobbyists and lobbyists, and I do not pretend to be very familiar with either class; but I think I do know a few railroad lawyers when I see them. [Laughter.] I have been a practitioner of the law in an humble way for a number of years, but I have never been retained by any of the great interstate-commerce railroads and corporations. I have been retained, however, now and then by a few honest and sensible clients [laughter] to institute suits against railroads and other interstate-commerce corporations, and my clients will inform those desirous of knowledge concern-

ing the matter that I have generally succeeded in securing for them a speedy trial, justice, and a square deal. As a legislator my sympathies have always been with the under dog, with the poor and the oppressed, with the toiler and the bread winner; and whenever an injustice was committed by some powerful corporation against the weak and the helpless I have been on the latter's side; and as a lawyer my field of professional endeavor has been along the lines of helping the poor and the humble and the distressed; and I suppose I am so constituted that I will continue to do so all the rest of my life, to the loss no doubt of my bank account, but with the approval of my conscience. [Applause.]

I could have been a railroad lawyer had I desired to enter that field of human activity; in fact, I have received one or two offers in my time to devote my energies to that branch of the law. I recollect a very flattering offer made to me a few years ago of \$25,000 a year; but I never was very anxious to make money, with me money is a secondary consideration; and I have preferred to pursue the even tenor of the simple life, to work out my professional salvation in my own way and my political career along my own lines. [Laughter.] I work pretty hard here in the Halls of Congress, day in and day out, week in and week out, trying to do the right thing for my constituents and the square thing for the good of the people generally throughout the country. I am content with my work; I rather like it. I would not exchange places with any of the opulent members of "the system." I have cast my lot along the pleasant sunshiny highways of humanity; but sometimes it seems to me that almost every man in the land who has a grievance, or thinks he has a grievance, comes to me to set things right and to secure him justice. I spend a great deal of valuable time investigating some of these complaints, and it takes much labor to do so conscientiously; but whenever I find a case that is really and truly a worthy cause I do not fear or hesitate to take up the burden of the fight and do the best I can. This may be altruistic, and I know that often my efforts are unappreciated, derided, misconstrued, and futile, but I suppose, nevertheless, that I will go on doing so to the end of my time. [Applause.]

I know that the world, that the great big world,
From the pauper up to the king,
Has a different tale from the tale I tell,
And a different song to sing;
But for me, I care not a single fig
If they say I'm wrong or I'm right,
For I'll always go in, if I go in at all,
For the under dog in the fight.

[Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to give credit in this debate to whom credit is due. I want to say that I have been an interested listener to several of the excellent and eloquent speeches which have been delivered for and against this measure, not only an attentive and interested listener, but I have been edified, instructed, and highly entertained. I listened with great interest, as I always do, to my genial friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEX]. He ridiculed the bill and arraigned its effectiveness, and I was much amused by the serious earnestness of his incisive and epigrammatic and eloquent remarks. The gentleman nearly

convinced me that I ought to vote against the bill of my distinguished and erudite friend from the classic fields of Iowa. [Laughter.] I was greatly interested and listened with rapture to the studied periods of my always eloquent and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD]. He seemed to prove to his own satisfaction the inability of the people to govern themselves. [Laughter.] His argument was an indictment of free institutions—an arraignment of the power of public opinion. [Applause.] I can not follow the gentleman from Maine. I believe in the people. I trust the people. I know the people are capable of self-government. [Applause.] I was much impressed with the beautiful diction and the eloquent words of the scholarly gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], who has given a great deal of study and consideration to every phase of this whole subject; and if I did not know a little about it myself, I think I would be inclined to take his pessimistic view of the results that will follow if this bill should become a law in its present shape. [Laughter.] With these three eminent statesmen against the bill, I began to ponder whether I could conscientiously give it my vote and my support. [Laughter.] I always try to be right, but I know I am not infallible, and I concluded to wait—to hold my peace—to content my soul in patience—until I could listen to the wisdom and the dulcet voice of my dear old friend and philosopher the learned and experienced gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]; and lo! he began to speak; and to my amazement I heard him call the bill a fake—just think of it—a fake! [Laughter.] Is it any wonder we are bewildered? [Laughter.]

But, then, it is only fair for me to say that although I do not often agree with the gentleman from Ohio regarding the merits of proposed legislation, I do, in this instance, however, agree substantially with him regarding the significance of the omission in this bill of express cars and palace cars and sleeping cars. I do not know of any good reason why these railway cars should be carefully omitted from the grasp of the provisions of this bill, but perhaps we shall be enlightened about this later on by some of the speakers for the bill. [Laughter.] I think these palace and sleeping and express cars should be amenable to the plan and the scope and the possibilities of this bill, and I would amend the bill to bring them within its provisions, together with all the other private cars and car lines of the country. The private-car line system is one of the most iniquitous frauds in the transportation business and should be wiped out. I am with the gentleman from Ohio on these propositions. I shall be glad to vote with him to put all these cars under the provisions of this bill. I commend the gentleman from Ohio, and I assure him I shall vote for his proposed amendment—

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SULZER. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I did not state that I would offer any such amendment as that.

Mr. SULZER. I thought that is what the gentleman wanted to do. If I remember correctly, the gentleman was complaining because he could not—

Mr. GROSVENOR. I pointed out the care that had been taken in the drafting of the bill. But my amendment is a matter of very much more importance, in my judgment. That is the one relating to the commingling of the corporation that produces the goods that are shipped on the railroad and the corporation that handles the railroad.

Mr. SULZER. Very good; I am with the gentleman on that proposition, too. [Laughter.] But I understood the gentleman from Ohio to complain about the omission from the provisions of this bill of palace, sleeping, and express cars, and I concur with the gentleman and justify his complaint, and think it is a mistake that these cars, doing an interstate-commerce business, should be omitted from the provisions of the measure we have before us. They should be included in this bill, and the gentleman from Ohio was quite right in what he said in this connection. But he went further and complained most bitterly that the House was going to stand by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and pass this bill just as it is now, just as it came from the committee, without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," and vote down every amendment that will be offered by any Member to strengthen the bill and make it a more perfect measure. [Laughter.]

I was astonished when I heard the gentleman make this complaint. It was a great surprise to me to hear him protest about the majority standing by its own committee. I am making no complaint, because I know it is useless, and I am not surprised that the majority will stand by the bill of the committee and vote down all amendments. I am surprised, however, that we are granted the poor privilege—for the sake of the record—of offering amendments at all to make the bill better, more perfect, more complete, and more effectual. I am surprised that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not go to the Committee on Rules of the House and have that committee, of which the gentleman from Ohio is an active member, bring in a rule, as it usually does, making this bill a special order and precluding a Member from offering an amendment, allowing him only the right to do one thing, and that is to vote for the bill or to vote against it. So the gentleman from Ohio complains that he is only allowed to offer an amendment with the knowledge that it is understood and agreed between the majority and the members of the committee that all amendments are to be voted down; and that the bill is to be railroaded through the House just as it came from the committee. [Applause.]

It is some consolation, however, to me to know that the gentleman from Ohio realizes once in a while that Republican chickens come home to roost. [Laughter.] But I inferred the gentleman as a last resort intended to vote for the bill. So shall I; but I do so with reluctance and many misgivings, and only because I know that it is not the best bill, but the one bill that the real and sincere friends of railroad-rate reform and governmental regulation of interstate common carriers can get for the people at the present time. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have earnestly studied the various bills which have been introduced thus far in this Congress regarding railway-rate legislation and the regulation of interstate commerce transportation companies, and briefly referred to by

name and number at the beginning of the report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which accompanies the bill now under consideration. It will be of considerable interest, in my opinion, for the industrious Members of the House to get these respective bills and read each and every one of them carefully.

One of the best of these bills, in my judgment, is the measure introduced by my friend and colleague, Mr. HEARST, H. R. 469, entitled "A bill to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to expedite the final decision of cases arising under the act to regulate commerce by creating an interstate commerce court." This is a brief and simple bill, but a very comprehensive measure, and goes further to correct these abuses and remedy these evils than any of the bills which have heretofore been introduced, and if Mr. HEARST's bill were a law I believe that it would effectually stop the abuses we are seeking to prevent. I am sorry the bill can not be brought before the House and voted for on its merits. It has many excellent features, and it seems to me that there are many provisions in it which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could to much advantage have incorporated into the bill which they reported, and if they had done so they would have made the bill now before us a very much stronger, and a very much better, and a very much more comprehensive measure in every respect; and one about whose constitutionality there could be absolutely no question.

There is to my mind no doubt about the effectiveness and the constitutionality of Mr. HEARST's bill, and there would be no question about the constitutionality of the bill now under consideration if the provision regarding the fixing of the rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the creation of the court to review the orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission were taken from Mr. HEARST's bill and embodied in the bill of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I think it is a matter of regret that this was not done. I go further and say I think it was a mistake that the Hearst bill was not reported to the House instead of the committee bill. There should be no politics in this matter. There should be no rivalry and no personal vanity. We ought to all strive to accomplish the results so earnestly desired by the people of this country. This is one of the great questions of the day, affecting every man, woman, and child in the land, and we should all rise superior to petty politics and personal glory and try to accomplish results; and if that had been done I believe the Hearst bill would now be under consideration instead of the pending bill; or, at all events, that many of the provisions of Mr. HEARST's bill would have been put into the bill now presented to the House, and that would have made the bill before us a very much stronger, a very much better, and a very much more comprehensive measure in every way, so far as the solution of these problems are concerned, and there would have been no question of doubt as to its constitutionality.

I believe, and I assert, that if Mr. HEARST's bill were substituted for the committee bill now under consideration we would be a great deal further advanced in the progress we are making to fix just and reasonable railway rates and to regulate transportation companies doing an interstate-commerce business.

Mr. HEARST's bill meets the demands of the people, and means what it says and says what it means. Every friend of genuine railway rate reform and for the regulation of interstate transportation corporations knows what Mr. HEARST's bill will do, but no two members of the Committee on Interstate Commerce can agree as to just what the bill reported unanimously from that committee, and now before us, will accomplish if enacted into law. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, let me say again that I do not think this bill is a perfect bill by any means, and I believe it can be made a very much more effective measure if it were amended along certain indicated lines. When the bill is open for amendment I shall offer several amendments to perfect and strengthen the bill, which I hope will be adopted.

I shall offer an amendment to the bill in line 15 on page 10, after the word "any," by inserting the words "relation of rates or," so that this section of the bill will read: "Or that any relation of rates or regulations or practices whatsoever of such carrier." And in line 23, on the same page, after the word "what," I shall offer an amendment to insert the words "relation of rates or." This proposed amendment has been suggested by my friend and colleague, Mr. HEARST, and we deem it quite vital to the effectiveness of the measure. This bill absolutely ignores differentials and relations of rates. As the bill is now drawn a rate over one line to a given point may be just and reasonable, and a higher rate over the same line by a different route, or over another line, to another point may be also just and reasonable, and this would be an unjust discrimination that would work a great injury in favor of one city or locality as against another city or locality, and that could not be remedied by this bill if it were a law.

For instance, let us assume that the Commission should hold that the rate, we will say, from Chicago to Philadelphia of \$1 per ton is just and reasonable, and a rate of \$1.10 per ton from Chicago to New York over the same line, or a different line for that matter, may also be held by the Commission to be just and reasonable; and, of course, if the rates stood, as I have assumed, the traffic and the commerce would to a very large extent be diverted from the city of New York to the city of Philadelphia on account of the difference or discrimination in the relation of the rate; and this would apply to any other section of the country with equal or greater force. Thus, Philadelphia would be benefited at the expense of New York by an unjust discrimination, and New York would be powerless, under the terms of this bill, to remedy the injustice. The bill gives the Commission no power to fix a differential rate. Within recent years I am informed that nearly 1,000 complaints of unjust discriminations have been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and at least seven-tenths of all these complaints have grown out of this system of the relation of rates.

As this bill stands to-day this evil would be perpetuated and could not be corrected by the Commission even if the Commission wanted to do so. I think this is a serious defect in the bill, and it ought to be corrected by this amendment.

Then, on page 11, in line 6, of the bill I shall move the amendment heretofore referred to by striking out "thirty days after

notice to the carrier" and insert the word "immediately" in lieu thereof; and in line 8 to strike out the words "be suspended;" and in line 9 to strike out the words "be suspended or" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or modified;" and also strike out the words, in the same line, "competent jurisdiction" and insert in lieu thereof the words "last resort;" so that that portion of this section will read as follows:

Such order—

That is, the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission fixing the rate—

shall go into effect immediately—

Instead of, as now provided in the bill, "thirty days after notice to the carrier"—

and shall remain in force and be observed by the carrier, unless the same shall be modified or set aside by the Commission, or modified or set aside by the court of last resort.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment goes to the very core of the whole matter. I have given considerable study to the bill, and I believe that the weakest part of the pending measure is in this very provision, and a bill, like a chain, is no stronger than its weakest link. If this amendment suggested by me is adopted, the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission fixing the rate would take effect immediately and remain in full force and effect until modified or set aside by the Commission or the court of last resort. This amendment is squarely in line, and on all fours, with the recommendations of the President in his message a year ago last December. He was right then; and I say now that any other relief will be futile. As I understand it, we are legislating to remedy evils, not to encourage abuses and entail endless litigation; but under the terms of the pending bill the rate will not take effect until thirty days after notice to the carrier. I claim and I say that it ought to take effect immediately and remain in full force and effect unless modified or set aside by the Commission or modified or set aside by the court of last resort. [Applause.] Under the terms of the present bill, as I have pointed out, if the Commission makes an order fixing a rate it does not go into effect until "thirty days after notice to the carrier," and then it can be suspended, modified, or set aside by any court of competent jurisdiction.

Now, what does this mean? What will be its effect? As I read it, and as I understand it, the effect will be that when the Interstate Commerce Commission on the complaint of some injured shipper makes an order fixing a just and reasonable rate, in place of an unjust and an unreasonable rate, the transportation company will have thirty days in which to prepare a case and go into a court of competent jurisdiction and get an injunction suspending the operation of the order theretofore made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the old rate will go on until the matter is finally adjudicated by the United States Supreme Court; and this may take years and years, and in the meantime the shipper is being mulcted in the old unreasonable railroad rates and put to the expense of retaining lawyers, getting witnesses, and preparing an expensive law case that will take, perhaps, until the millenium to settle; thus causing, in my opinion, an endless delay and an useless amount of ex-

pensive litigation, and all at the expense of the injured shipper; and if he is a poor man he can not afford to incur the expense of this litigation. This bill then will give him no relief. This is one of the jokers in the bill; one of the bad features for the people, one of the good features for the transportation companies. It is the protection afforded the railroads. It is one of the reasons why, in my judgment, the railroads are not opposed to this bill. They can litigate these orders of the Commission until doomsday.

I shall offer the amendment I refer to at the proper time, and then we shall see if this bill is for the railroads or the people. The adoption or rejection of this amendment will determine the matter, in my opinion, to a very great extent. I am with the people in this fight, and I want to see placed on the statute books ere this session of Congress adjourns an effectual law that will accomplish in this matter what the people now demand. I think it will be a sad mistake if we attempt in a superficial way to temporize with this question. You may fool some of the people to-day, but you can not fool all the people to-morrow, and I predict that if we do not meet this question at this time in a square and broad and manly way the people will rebuke us, and rise up in their might and wrath and send here Representatives who will carry out their wishes and who will do the square thing, and who will write upon the statute books more stringent and more radical laws not only for Government rate making and Government regulation, but for Government control and Government ownership of the great public transportation utilities doing an interstate-commerce business. Mark what I say, it will be one relief or the other, one thing or the other, one remedy or the other. Take your choice—Government regulation now or Government ownership hereafter. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say that another amendment which I shall offer at the proper time and seek to have incorporated in the pending measure is the following, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That every common carrier by railroad subject to the provisions of this act shall be liable to any of its employees who are engaged in the transportation of such persons or property, or, in the case of his death, to his personal representative or heirs at law, for all damages which may result from the negligence or mismanagement of any of its officers, agents, or employees, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, ways, or works.

That in all actions hereafter brought against any such common carrier by railroad to recover damages for personal injuries to an employee, or where such injuries have resulted in his death, the fact that the employee may have been guilty of contributory negligence shall not bar a recovery where his contributory negligence was slight in comparison to that of the employer.

That no contract of employment, insurance, relief benefit, or indemnity for injury or death entered into by or on behalf of any employee, nor the acceptance of any such insurance, relief benefit, or indemnity by the person entitled thereto, shall constitute any bar or defense to any action brought to recover damages for personal injuries to or death of such employee: *Provided, however*, That upon the trial of such action against any such common carrier by railroad the defendant may set off therein any sum it has contributed toward any such insurance, relief benefit, or indemnity that may have been paid to the injured employee, or, in case of his death, to his heirs at law.

That nothing in this act shall be held to limit the duty of common carriers by railroads or impair the rights of their employees under the safety-appliance act of March 2, 1893, as amended April 1, 1896, and March 2, 1903.

Mr. SULZER. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, speaks for itself, and is offered by me in good faith in the name of the hundreds of thousands of railway employees of the United States. Under existing law an employee of a railroad company can not recover damages for injuries sustained in the line of his duty by reason of the negligence of the railroad or the carelessness of a fellow-workman. This amendment makes a railroad company or a common carrier liable to the employee, and in case of his death to his heirs at law, in damages for the negligence or mismanagement of any of its officers, agents, or employees, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, ways, or works. This amendment is not new. It is similar to a number of employers' liability bills which have been introduced in every Congress for the past twenty years. It has been indorsed and recommended by the Industrial Commission and by some of the ablest thinkers and jurists and writers in the country. The best thought to-day in the civilized world favors this change in the law applicable to common carriers, and several States in the Union have recently adopted it.

This amendment is the one act of legislation above all others that the railroad employees of this country demand, and which they have tried to secure from Congress for the last quarter of a century. In justice to these deserving and heroic men, who daily risk their lives and their limbs in hazardous occupations, it ought to be the law of the land; and if it were I unhesitatingly assert that there would be fewer railroad accidents and less loss of life by reason of them every year in the United States.

The amendment is a just measure in the interest of a most worthy and industrious and reliable class of faithful and intelligent workmen. They are entitled to it as a matter of right and in the name of justice. A railroad company, in my judgment, should be held responsible in damages to its employees for its own carelessness and for the negligence of any of its officers or agents, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, ways, or works. I hope that when I offer this amendment to the pending bill when it is before the House and open to amendment—and I give notice now that I certainly shall offer it—that it will be accepted and adopted; and I know if it is adopted it will be but an act of common justice to the great army of reliable and industrious workmen of the great transportation companies, and a safeguard against accident and injury to the people generally who ride on the railroads of our country.

Make the railroads responsible in damages to their employees and take my word for it the railroads will see to it that very few accidents happen. [Applause.] If you will look over the statistics of the country, you will find that the number of railroad accidents every year is increasing, the loss of life appalling, and the list of the injured up in the hundred thousand column. Thousands of people are killed every year by railroad accidents, and tens of thousands are injured and maimed for life through the gross negligence of these interstate-commerce transportation corporations, but on account of this antiquated and unjust and discriminatory law there is no liability to the railroads. I say this old English, antique, fellow-servant doc-

trine, as applied to the negligence of modern railroads, is eminently unjust, and every fair-minded lawyer who has ever tried a damage suit will tell you the same thing. [Applause.] It is so ridiculous that sixteen foreign states in Europe do not now recognize it, and a majority of our own States in recent years have either abolished or modified it to a great degree. Even autocratic Russia in this regard protects her industrial railroad workers. But our own Government has yet to enact the first line of this kind of desirable legislation demanded by the vast army of patriotic and self-sacrificing railroad employees who are daily giving up their lives and their limbs to the negligence of the transportation corporations of our country.

Railroad companies by virtue of their interstate character are brought directly under the control of Congress, and therefore it is necessary from a legal standpoint for Congress to enact this law. Several State legislatures have recently met and passed such laws, but the Republicans in this House—and they have had control of the House for over ten years—have assiduously prevented the passage of this bill; and its enactment seems to be as far off, if not farther, than it was ten years ago. It seems the railroads have more influence here than the people.

But it is said by some of the Republican Members who represent districts in which these railroad employees reside that they are in favor of this legislation and would be glad to vote for it if they could only get a chance to do so. They say the Judiciary Committee, to which the bill has been referred, will not report it and give them an opportunity to vote for it. This, I say, is the merest subterfuge and no answer to the appeal of these earnest employees for relief. The Republicans can vote the day after to-morrow for this amendment when I offer it, and if it goes out on a point of order, they can vote for a rule to make the amendment germane to the bill. Did they not vote for a rule the other day to abrogate the eight-hour labor law in the Isthmian Canal Zone? Then let them vote to adopt this amendment or for a rule to make it germane to this bill. The Republicans in this House can no longer evade the issue and their responsibility. Now is the time for them to show their colors. Now is the time for them to be counted for or against this just and humane measure. [Applause.] The Republicans in this House are responsible for the failure for the last ten years to pass this bill, and I do not think the intelligent railroad men of the country, who are asking for this just and humane law, will longer permit the Republicans to deceive them regarding their failure to keep their promise made over and over again to enact this bill into law.

Sir, since 1896 the Republican party has practically promised the railroad workmen of the country this legislation, but it has absolutely failed to live up to its promise and enact the law. They have ordered several similar bills, to the amendment I have just proposed, to be killed in the Judiciary Committee. The Republicans have been in absolute power for the past ten years in all branches of the Government, and I charge that they have failed and neglected to carry out this promise, or any other promise, heretofore made to the toilers and the working people of the country. Their pledges to the working people have not been redeemed. They will not be redeemed. In passing laws for the workers of the land the Republican party is

long on promise and short on performance. An ounce of performance is worth a ton of promise. I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of the railroad employees of this country, and I sincerely believe that the amendment I propose in their interest, and which is all they ask, is not only just, but it is humane, and it should be granted to them. [Applause.] These faithful employees devote the best years of their lives to the service of large industrial corporations doing an interstate-commerce transportation business, and when they are injured in the line of their duty through the negligence of the corporation, or the carelessness of a fellow-employee, they should have the right under the law to recover damages the same as any passenger traveling for hire on the railroad. I say as a lawyer and as a legislator that any other rule is contrary to the spirit of the age. [Applause.]

The wisdom and the justice and the humanity of such a law should be apparent to all, and there is no better time than the present and no better way than the one I suggest to place this just law on the statute books. If the Republicans mean to do what they promised, they will accept my amendment and put it in this bill; if they were simply fooling the railway working people when they promised to pass this measure, they will object to it and rule it out. We shall see ere long how sincere these promising Republicans are. I believe the amendment will be germane to the pending legislation; but if it is not, I put the Republicans on notice now, and I suggest that the Republican organization of the House bring in a special rule providing that this proposed amendment in behalf of the railroad employees be made germane to his bill. The Republican organization of the House brought in a special rule the other day to put an amendment on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill suspending the eight-hour law in the Isthmian Canal Zone. If you can do it in that case, you can do it in this case. Be fair and be honest now with these deserving people. Here is the opportunity to prove your sincerity. The other day the amendment abrogating the eight-hour law was made germane to an appropriation bill quick enough when you wanted to do it, and the eight-hour law was ruthlessly "suspended" without giving the labor representatives an opportunity to be heard before a committee of this House. [Applause.]

If the Republicans are sincere in regard to their promises to the employees of the great railroad organizations of this country they will put the amendment proposed by me, and just read by the Clerk, into this railroad bill enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It appropriately belongs in this bill. Be honest and do it. The Republican party has promised the railroad working people this law, and I am offering it now as an amendment to this bill, and in my opinion it properly belongs in this bill, to see whether or not the Republicans intend to keep faith with the toilers, and to live up to their promise to the working people on the railroads of the United States. If the Republicans are sincere in what they have promised to these industrious working people they will vote to adopt this amendment, but if they simply made that promise to catch the votes of these railway employees then this amendment will not be permitted to go into this bill, but will be stricken out when I offer it, by some Republican raising the point of order; and if the

point of order is sustained by the Republican Chairman of this committee on the ground that it is not germane to the bill, then I ask again that the Committee on Rules bring in a special order providing that this amendment be made germane to this bill so that every Member can vote on it. [Applause.]

Let us have a record vote and find out the truth. I believe I can safely say that every Democrat on this side of the House will vote for it. If the amendment is not incorporated into this bill it will be because the Republicans do not want it incorporated into the bill; it will be because the Republicans are insincere and have been fooling the thousands and thousands of working men employed by the great railroads and interstate transportation companies of the country.

I shall offer this amendment in good time, and I shall put to the test the sincerity of the Republicans in this House who promise the working people so much in every political campaign, and who give them so little after the campaign is over and they get back into full power in the legislative branch of the Government. I want to prove by this amendment to the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, to the Brotherhood of Railway Engineers and Firemen, and to the Brotherhood of Railway Employees who are their true friends and who are their real enemies in the Halls of Congress, and the record that will be made when this amendment is offered by me to this bill will be a light to guide railway employees in the future when they come to exercise that greatest of all American privileges—the elective franchise. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, at this time I desire to refer to another matter which I deem of some importance in connection with this pending legislation in regard to railway rates, and to give notice that when the pending bill is before the House for amendment, it is my intention to offer as an amendment my bill, now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House, entitled "A bill to create the Department of Transportation," which I now send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to create the Department of Transportation.

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be at the seat of Government an executive department to be known as the Department of Transportation, and a Secretary of Transportation, who shall be a Cabinet officer and the head thereof, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive a salary of \$8,000 per annum, and whose term and tenure of office shall be like that of the heads of the other Executive Departments; and section 158 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to include such Department of Transportation, and the provisions of title 4 of the Revised Statutes, including all amendments thereto, are hereby made applicable to said Department.

Sec. 2. That there shall be in said Department a First Assistant Secretary of Transportation, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$6,000 per annum. He shall have charge of all matters in the Department of Transportation relating to steam and electric railways, and shall perform such other duties as shall be prescribed by the Secretary or required by law.

There shall be in the said Department a Second Assistant Secretary of Transportation, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum; and he shall have charge of all matters in the Department of Transportation relating to telegraph lines.

There shall be in the said Department of Transportation a Third Assistant Secretary of Transportation, to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum; and he shall have charge of all matters in the Department of Transportation relating to telephone lines.

There shall be in the said Department of Transportation a Fourth Assistant Secretary of Transportation, to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum; and he shall have charge of all matters in the Department of Transportation relating to waterways and similar lines of transportation thereon.

There shall be in the said Department of Transportation a Fifth Assistant Secretary of Transportation, to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum; and he shall have charge of all matters of the Department of Transportation relating to pipe lines.

There shall be in the said Department of Transportation a Sixth Assistant Secretary of Transportation, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary of \$5,000 a year; and he shall have charge of all matters in the Department of Transportation relating to the express business.

There shall be one chief clerk, and a disbursing clerk, and such other clerical assistance as may from time to time be authorized by Congress in each of the said assistant secretaries' departments; and the Auditor for the State and other Departments shall receive all accounts accruing in, or relative to, the Department of Transportation and examine the same and thereafter certify the balance and transmit the accounts, with the vouchers and certificate, to the Comptroller of the Treasury for his decision thereon.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the province and duty of said Department of Transportation to inspect, examine, and regulate, as may be prescribed by law, all corporations engaged in interstate or foreign commerce as common carriers, or owners or operators of transportation highways; and to this end it shall be vested with jurisdiction and control of the departments, bureaus, offices, and branches of the public service herein-after specified, and with such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by law.

SEC. 4. That the following-named offices, bureaus, divisions, and branches of the public service, now and heretofore under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and all that appertain to the same, known as the Life-Saving Service, the Light-House Board, and the Light-House Service, the Marine-Hospital Service, the Steamboat-Inspection Service, the Bureau of Navigation, and the United States Shipping Commissioner, and the same are hereby transferred from the Department of Commerce and Labor to the Department of Transportation, and the same shall hereafter remain under the jurisdiction and supervision of the last-named Department; and that the Secretary of Transportation shall have complete control of the work of gathering and distributing statistical information naturally relating to the subjects confined to his Department; and to this end said Secretary shall have power to employ any or either of said bureaus, and to rearrange such statistical work and to distribute or consolidate the same, as may be deemed desirable in the public interest; and the said Secretary shall also have authority to call upon other departments of the Government for statistical data and results obtained by them; and the Secretary of Transportation shall collate, arrange, and publish such statistical information so obtained in such manner as may to him seem wise.

SEC. 5. That there shall be in the Department of Transportation six bureaus, to be called the Bureaus of Transportation Corporations, and a chief of each of said bureaus, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve under each of the six assistant secretaries of the Department of Transportation, and who shall receive a salary of \$4,000 per annum. There shall also be in each of said bureaus one chief clerk and one auditor and such number of examiners as may be needed to carry out the purposes of this act; said auditors and examiners shall be expert accountants and shall be paid a salary to be fixed by law and necessary expenses. There shall also be such other clerical assistants as may from time to time be authorized by Congress. It shall be the province and duty of said Bureaus of Transportation Corporations, under the direction of the Secretary of Transportation, to inspect, examine, and regulate all corporations engaged in interstate and foreign commerce as common carriers, or owners or operators of transportation highways, by gathering, compiling, publishing, and supplying all available and useful information concerning such corporations, including the manner in which their business is conducted, and by such other methods and means as

may be prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation, or provided by law.

Every corporation governed by this act shall make annual reports in writing to the auditor, and such reports shall in all cases include:

(a) Capital authorized and issued, the amount paid up in cash or otherwise, with a statement of the method of payment where it is not in cash.

(b) Debts, including details as to the amounts thereof, and security given therefor, if any.

(c) Obligations due from officers, which shall be separately stated.

(d) A statement of assets and the method of valuing the same, whether at cost price, by appraisal, or otherwise, and of the allowance made for depreciation. Small items of personal property included in the plant may be described by the term "sundries" or like general term.

(e) Gross earnings for the period covered by the report, all deductions necessary for interest, taxes, and expenses of all sorts, the surplus available for dividends, and dividends actually declared.

(f) Increase of assets since the last statement, with a showing in what way such increase has been secured.

(g) The names and addresses of all stockholders, with the number of shares held by each at the date of the report.

(h) The amount of stock disposed of and the amount of property taken for stock sold since the last report, with all facts necessary to show the result of the transaction.

(i) A statement showing that the corporation in question has not, during the period covered by the said report, received or given any rebates, drawbacks, special rates, or other discriminating advantages, or preferences by money payments or otherwise, from or to any railroad, pipe line, water carrier, or other transportation company or paid to any shipper any such payments; or if any such have been received or given, stating to whom, from whom, on what account, and in what manner they were so received or given, with all other details necessary for the full understanding of the transaction or transactions.

(j) The names and addresses of all officers, location of transfer or registry offices, wherever located.

(k) A statement that the corporation has not fixed prices or done any other act with a view to restricting trade or driving any competitor out of business.

(l) A statement that the corporation is or is not a party to any contract, combination, or conspiracy in the form of a trust or otherwise, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or Territories or with foreign nations.

(m) It shall be the duty of the auditor of each Bureau of Transportation Corporations to prescribe the form of the reports before mentioned. He may, in his discretion, require additional reports at any time, upon reasonable notice, whenever he may see fit. But his determination shall be prima facie proof that the notice given is reasonable.

He may also require supplemental reports whenever, in his judgment, the report rendered is in any particular or particulars insufficient, evasive, or ambiguous.

He may prescribe rules so as to avoid undue detail in making the reports, but no detail of the business of the corporation shall be considered private so as to be exempt from the examination of the auditor whenever he may demand report thereon.

He shall make public in his reports, which shall be issued annually, all the information contained in the reports so made to him. When a report has been made by a corporation and, with all supplemental and additional reports required by the auditor, shall have been approved by him, the corporation making such report or reports shall publish the same in some newspaper nearest to its principal place of business, after the usual custom in such cases, with the auditor's minutes of approval, and shall file with the auditor proof of such publication by the publisher's certificate.

Sec. 6. That if any corporation shall fail to make a report when required, either by the terms of this act or when required by the auditor, as herein provided, said corporation shall be fined not less than one-twentieth of 1 per cent of its last annual gross earnings for each offense. Every week of failure after such reasonable written demand has been made by the auditor shall constitute a separate and distinct offense. In case also of failure, each of the directors of the said corporation shall be ineligible for the year succeeding the next annual meeting to hold either directorship or any other office in the said corporation; but any director shall be exempt from said penalty upon making a statement under oath that he has individually made such a report to the best of his ability from the facts at his disposal.

If such report is false in any material respect the officer making same shall be guilty of perjury and the corporation shall be fined not less than ten thousand nor more than fifty thousand dollars, and each false statement in any material matter shall constitute a separate offense. All fines and penalties imposed by this act shall be recovered or enforced in any court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC 7. That it shall be the duty of the examiners, under the direction of the auditor, to make examinations of any corporation governed by this act.

Any of said examiners presenting his official credentials shall be furnished by the officers of the corporation with every facility for complete and full examination, not only of the books, but all of the property, records, or papers of the corporation, which may be necessary, in the judgment of the examiner, for a complete knowledge of the affairs of the concern.

Such examinations shall not be at fixed periods, but shall be at such times as the auditor shall fix and without notice.

Examiners shall have the power to examine under oath all officers or employees of the corporation, or any other persons having any knowledge of its affairs, and to send for, demand, and inspect books, papers, and any other matter of evidence whatever which is in the possession or control of the said corporation.

For the purpose of this act examiners shall have power to require, by subpoena, the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of all books, papers, contracts, agreements, and documents relating to any matter under investigation.

Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing, and in case of disobedience to a subpoena the examiner may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance.

And any of the circuit courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal of any witness to obey a subpoena issued to any corporation subject to the provisions of this act, or other person, issue an order requiring such corporation or other person to appear before said examiner (and produce books and papers if so ordered) and give evidence touching the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as and for a contempt thereof. The claim that any such testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate the person giving such evidence or testimony shall not excuse such person from testifying; but such testimony shall not be used against such person on the trial of any criminal proceeding.

The auditor shall also have all the authority of an examiner in any case wherein he chooses himself to act.

No examiner shall be assigned to examine any corporation who is himself interested in the business thereof, or of any competing concern, or who has relatives who are so interested.

It shall be unlawful for an examiner to divulge private business except by his report to the auditor. But such report, or the substance thereof, shall be open to public inspection.

Each examiner shall follow the rules, regulations, and directions which the auditor may from time to time lay down or communicate to him as to the method of examination, the form of report, the matters to be covered by the said examination, and all matters pertaining to his duties.

Said examinations and reports shall always cover, among others, the following questions and matters:

(a) Has the said corporation, or any officer thereof, during period covered by the examination and report, given or received any rebates, drawbacks, special rates, or other discriminations, advantages, preferences, by money payments, or otherwise, to or from any railroad, pipe line, water carrier, or other transportation company, or person engaged in interstate commerce, or from any manufacturer or vendor of any supplies or materials purchased by or for said corporation.

(b) If there have been such preferences when they were received or given, from whom or to whom, on what account and in what manner, giving all details necessary to a full understanding of the transaction.

(c) Is the said corporation or any of its officers a member of any combination having, seeking, or intending to secure a monopoly of any commodity other than such monopolies as are legally granted by patents or otherwise?

(d) Has the said corporation any such monopoly or does it use methods tending to secure such monopoly?

(e) Has it made any contracts or agreements tending to secure any such monopoly to itself or any other concern, whether owned by an individual or individuals, a corporation, or some combination of individuals or corporations?

(f) Is such corporation, or any of its officers, a party to any contract, agreement, combination, or conspiracy, in the form of a trust or otherwise, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations?

(g) Has the corporation, or any of its officers, purchased or does it hold the stock of any other corporation for the purpose of controlling its management?

Said reports of the examiners shall be prima facie evidence as to their truth, and may be introduced in evidence in all courts to prove the facts therein set forth. Copies certified by the Auditor shall be admissible with like effect and under the same circumstances as the original.

The word "corporation," wherever used in this act, shall be deemed to include companies and associations existing or authorized by the laws of the United States, the laws of any State or Territory, or the laws of any foreign country.

Sec. 8. That the Secretary of Transportation shall annually, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to the Congress, giving an account of all money received and disbursed by him and his Department, and describing the work done by the Department in inspecting, examining, and regulating, as prescribed by law, all corporations engaged in interstate and foreign commerce; in the ownership, or operation, of any of the foregoing-described transportation highways or lines of transportation or engaged as common carriers in interstate or foreign commerce, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties and purposes of the Department. He shall also, from time to time, make such special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President, or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent.

Sec. 9. That the Secretary of Transportation shall have charge of the building or premises occupied by or appropriated to and for the Department of Transportation, of the library, furniture, fixtures, records, and other property appertaining to it, or hereafter required for use in its business; and he shall be allowed to expend for periodicals and the purposes of the library and for the rental of appropriate quarters for the accommodation of the Department of Transportation within the District of Columbia, and for all other incidental expenses such sums as Congress may provide from time to time: *Provided, however*, That where any office, bureau, or branch of the public service transferred to the Department of Transportation by this act is occupying rented buildings or premises it may still continue to do so until other suitable quarters are provided for its use: *And provided further*, That all officers, clerks, and employees now employed in any of the bureaus, offices, departments, or branches of the public service referred to in this act transferred to the Department of Transportation are each and all hereby transferred to said Department at their present grades and salaries except where otherwise provided: *And provided further*, That all laws prescribing the work and defining the duties of the several bureaus, offices, departments, or branches of the public service by this act transferred to and made a part of the Department of Transportation shall, so far as the same are not in conflict with the provisions of this act, remain in force and effect until provided by law.

Sec. 10. That all power and authority heretofore possessed or exercised by the head of any Executive Department over any bureau, office, branch, or division of the public service by this act transferred to the Department of Transportation, or any business arising therefrom or appertaining thereto, whether of an appellate or advisory character, or otherwise, shall hereafter be vested in and exercised by the head of the said Department of Transportation. And all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

All branches of the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission, except such as relates to the work of said Commission in examining into and regulating rates and classification of rates for transportation, are hereby transferred to the Department of Transportation. But nothing in this act shall be construed as in any way abandoning any of the powers over interstate commerce and interstate carriers conferred by the interstate commerce act.

Sec. 11. That it shall be the duty of the Department of Transportation to especially see to it that all the laws regulating common carriers and interstate transportation highways are strictly enforced and that all violations of the same are promptly punished according to law. And said Department of Transportation shall execute promptly the enforcement of all orders and decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission affecting rates, classifications, and so forth.

SEC. 12. That all said transportation corporations, and their stockholders, officers, directors, and agents, are hereby required to report annually to the Department of Transportation within ten days after each Congressional and Presidential election all sums of money contributed directly or indirectly by them to the committees, candidates, or campaign funds of the separate political parties engaged in said elections.

SEC. 13. That a person, to be designated by the Secretary of State, shall be appointed to formulate, under his direction, for the instruction of consular officers, the requests of the Secretary of Transportation, and to prepare from the dispatches of consular officers for transmission to the Secretary of Transportation such information as appertains to the work of the Department of Transportation; and such person shall be the chief of such bureau, with a salary of \$4,000 a year, and be furnished with such clerical assistance as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 14. That this act shall take effect immediately.

MR. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the bill just read by the Clerk, introduced by me, to create the Department of Transportation, is a most comprehensive measure, dealing in a logical way and a practicable manner with this great interstate-commerce transportation problem. The measure provides for particular officials in the new department to investigate, report on, and regulate steam and electric railways, telegraphs, telephones, waterway traffic, pipe lines, and the express business. Powers are conferred on the department to obtain full information not only as to rates and other traffic arrangements, but as to the genuine capital employed, the resources and liabilities, earnings, dividends, etc.; and penalties, rather more severe than those usually made for the tender discipline of lawless corporations, are fixed, such as heavy fines and ineligibility of directors to retain their office when they have made false reports or defied the officials seeking information. The purpose of the bill is not to interfere with the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission in examining into and regulating rates, but to assist in the work of compelling the transportation companies to obey the law, as all others are expected to do; and if this bill were placed on the statute books, I feel confident it would help very much, and go very far to solve some of the intricate questions presented by these powerful interstate transportation systems.

I believe, sir, that if a simple bill were prepared and enacted into law, making the giving or receiving of a rebate a felony, and the power conferred on the Interstate Commerce Commission, where rates were unjust and unreasonable, to fix just and reasonable rates and maintain the same, unless modified or set aside by the court of last resort, and my bill, which has just been read by the Clerk, placed by its side on the statute books, that the cause of the people would triumph, that the Government would control the situation, and be able to fix the rates and regulate the great interstate transportation systems of our country, instead of the great interstate transportation companies controlling and dominating the Government. [Applause.]

I have given much time and careful study to the problems which we have been debating here for the past week, and which are and have been live questions before the people of this country for the past ten or fifteen years; and I believe that if we had a Department of Transportation to regulate the railroads and the transportation companies of the country, as provided in my bill, and to see to it that they did not violate

the law, and if they did violate the law that the penalties of existing laws were speedily enforced against them, I believe that most of the problems would be solved and the question at issue settled in justice to all and with injury to none.

This bill of mine, sir, to create the Department of Transportation has been approved in editorials by some of the leading American newspapers. It has met with most favorable comment by many of the leading political writers and philosophical thinkers and railway economists of the land; and I believe that sooner or later this bill of mine, or some measure of a similar character, will be enacted into law by the Congress of the United States. It is the first attempt that has ever been made in this country to deal with this interstate-transportation problem in a scientific manner and a practicable business way. And just in this connection I want to have read a letter from the American Anti-Trust League, a well-known nonpartisan organization of earnest and determined and patriotic and liberty-loving Americans, who have done and are doing most effective work for reform, for good government, for the enforcement of the laws against the criminal trusts, for honest and just and equal laws, and for every righteous struggle in the cause of the plain people, and who are organized for influential work in every State in the Union. I ask the Clerk to read to the House the following letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

M. L. Lockwood, national president; H. B. Martin, national secretary; C. T. Bride, national treasurer; W. B. Fleming, national financial secretary; William M. Morgan, national recording secretary. *National executive committee.*—M. L. Lockwood (chairman), Pennsylvania; H. B. Martin (secretary), New York; F. S. Monnett, Ohio; P. E. Dowe, New York; F. J. Van Vorhis, Indiana; W. T. LaFollette, South Dakota; James Barrett, Georgia; William Prentiss, Illinois; C. T. Bride, District of Columbia; H. J. Schulteis, District of Columbia; W. B. Fleming, Kentucky; W. A. L. Riegel, New York. Capt. Charles Campbell, general organizer, New York.

"Salus populi suprema est lex."

THE AMERICAN ANTI-TRUST LEAGUE,
NATIONAL OFFICE, 1229 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW.,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1906.

DEAR SIR: The national executive committee of the American Anti-Trust League believing that the prompt and thorough enforcement of the laws governing the great transportation corporations now in control of the transportation business of the nation is of most vital importance to the whole people, and believing, after a careful examination of its main features, that H. R. 8453, the bill creating a department of transportation, introduced by Congressman WILLIAM SULZER, of New York, is a much needed and effective step toward securing the proper enforcement of the laws regulating transportation, we hereby heartily indorse the said bill and urge upon Congress that it be enacted into law at the present session for the following reasons:

First. Because at the present time there is no proper provision for the enforcement of the laws governing the vast transportation business of the United States.

Second. Because H. R. 8453 provides for a thoroughly competent department of the Government, charged with the sole duty of securing an effective enforcement of the laws and regulations governing the transportation industry.

Third. The creating of such an executive department of transportation, clothed with the comprehensive supervisory and regulative powers provided in Congressman SULZER's bill, will act as a powerful preventive of many violations of the law and will secure prompt punishment of the great corporate offenders who now seem to be beyond the reach of the law.

Fourth. Such a department of transportation, as provided in H. R. 8453, will secure full publicity in the workings of the transportation corporations, and thus prevent those numerous violations of the laws, which are only made possible because of their secrecy.

Fifth. The secret rebates and discriminations of the carriers which have built up the great criminal trusts will be prevented by the provisions embodied in Mr. SULZER's bill.

Sixth. The Interstate Commerce Commission being relieved of the enormous details of the executive duty of attempting to enforce the laws, will be able to much more effectively perform its proper function of regulating rates, classifications, etc.

Seventh. The defiance, both open and secret, of the laws by the great transportation corporations, which has become a national scandal and an intolerable abuse, can be easily put a stop to by the provisions for policing the railroad corporations and other transportation companies embodied in the Sulzer bill.

Eighth. H. R. 8453 also provides an effective check upon the great evils connected with the corrupt influence in elections, of the enormous contributions to the campaign funds of favored political parties and candidates which now prevails.

Ninth. H. R. 8453 greatly simplifies the work of government regulation and enforcement of existing laws relating to this vast transportation business by providing what we should always be extremely careful to maintain, viz, the complete separation of the legislative and executive branches of our government machinery.

For these reasons, and others that will readily commend themselves to all who carefully consider the provisions of the Department of Transportation bill (H. R. 8453), we request all friends of the proposed law to use their influence through commercial and industrial organizations, through the press, and with their Congressmen and Senators, to secure the passage of the bill at the present session of Congress.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
AMERICAN ANTITRUST LEAGUE.
H. B. MARTIN, *National Secretary*.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, that letter from the American Anti-Trust League of the United States, indorsing my bill to create the Department of Transportation, speaks for itself. It is a bugle call in no uncertain tones to every friend of governmental regulation of interstate transportation corporations to favor and aid in the enactment of the legislation proposed in my bill, and needs from me no further comment.

It is only just for me to say, however, that I have received numerous letters from all over the country in favor of this bill to create the Department of Transportation to regulate the great interstate transportation companies of the country and to be able to see to it that they obey the law and do no injury to the people. I have taken this opportunity to put the bill in the RECORD as a part of my speech to give notice to the Members of the House that I shall offer it as an amendment to the pending bill when the bill is open for amendment; and to get my measure, with all that it means, before the people generally of the country, so that those who are really interested in this great transportation question can read it for themselves, in connection with the matters now under discussion, and can study its features and their application to the problems we are endeavoring to solve; and I believe that those who look deeply and carefully into the subject and who truly and earnestly desire to accomplish something of a permanent character to compel the railways and other interstate transportation corporations, including the steamboats, the telegraph, the telephone, the express, and the pipe line companies, to obey the law of the land, will agree with me, that this proposed legislation, embodied in this bill introduced by me, goes further than any other plan heretofore conceived to treat all the matters involved in this discussion in a practical business way and in a comprehensive governmental manner. [Applause.]

I shall do my best, Mr. Chairman, in Congress and out of Congress, to make this bill a law. I do not say it is perfect. I know in the first instance that no proposed constructive legislation is

absolutely perfect; but I do claim that it is practicable, that it is comprehensive, that it is constitutional, and that it will go further in every way than any other plan thus far proposed to effectually check the evils which have grown up during the last twenty-five years in connection with our interstate transportation corporations, and do more than any other thing thus far suggested to remedy all the interstate transportation evils so bitterly complained of, at the present time, by the people of the United States. I shall welcome letters of approval, or suggestions and criticisms concerning this bill, from any and every citizen of our country who will take the trouble to study this broad and complete measure and the time to write me his views concerning it.

If it is claimed that the enactment of this bill into law would create additional offices and more expense to the Government, I answer, that if the people can get the right kind of men to occupy these offices, created in this bill, the gain will be the people's gain; and so far as the expense is concerned it will be infinitesimal in comparison with the importance of the data and statistics which will be procured, and the magnitude of the work which can be accomplished all along the line of the people's desires and demands. I say, and those who have studied this subject sufficiently to speak intelligently about it I think will agree with me, that the real solution of the problems presented in connection with the evils growing out of abuses by great interstate transportation systems is publicity and the rigid and prompt enforcement of the law, and this can only be done and accomplished by Government regulation and Government supervision of these interstate transportation corporations. It is just as practicable from a business view, and a governmental standpoint, as the supervision and the regulation by the Government of the national banks, and I say just as necessary. The railroads must be the servants of the people—not their masters.

This bill is in the interest of the toilers of our land, the shippers and producers of our country, and the people generally. If there be any genuine opposition to this legislation it comes from the interstate transportation systems that are violating the law, and dread publicity, and fear exposure, and speedy punishment through the agencies created by this bill for governmental supervision and regulation. I say the bill is a good bill, a just bill, a comprehensive bill, and a feasible constructive scheme of practical legislation along proper and intelligent lines to eradicate intrenched wrongs that are to-day oppressing the people and doing a great injustice to the citizens of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, legislative reforms are things of slow growth. It takes years of agitation to create sufficient public opinion to write a new law upon the statute books in the interest of all the people. But how different concerning the wishes of the selfish few. A great trust battenning on the people's credulity, or a great monopoly fattening on special privilege and nurtured by political favoritism, can come to the halls of Congress and pass a bill for its own selfish interests and greedy purposes during the lifetime of a single session. It takes, however, a long time for the people to win; but the truth will and must eventually prevail if one man dare assert it every day. So the truth of this proposition will win in the end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I shall offer this bill of mine as an amendment to the pending measure when the bill is open for amendment in the House. I believe my bill is germane to the proposition we are at present discussing and will not be subject to a point of order, but whether it is or not, I want to give notice now that I am in earnest in my contention for the enactment into law of this bill, and I shall keep up the fight week in and week out until the matter is properly presented to the House and an opportunity given for discussion and a vote taken upon it on its merits. The vast extent of the interstate transportation problem and the pressing and urgent importance of legislative remedies to correct existing evils to all the people of the United States are ample warrant for Congress to give this question the deepest investigation and the fullest consideration. There are many bills now before Congress affecting this question, some good, some bad, some indifferent, but no one of the bills, in my opinion, is a complete solution of all the questions involved in the problem. Hence the disposition on the part of some of the Republican leaders, which must be manifest to all, to rush through some plainly imperfect bill, to railroad to the Senate some defective measure, and then attempt to wash their hands of all further responsibility in the matter, as was done in the last Congress with the Esch-Townsend bill, is a procedure that should not commend itself to the Members of this House, and I know will not be approved by the people.

I do not claim that my bill is a panacea for all the evils growing out of the interstate transportation problem. But I do assert that my bill proposes to settle, and settle right and for a long time to come, a most important phase of this abstruse and intricate question, and to do it in a thorough, prompt, practical, effective, and businesslike way, by publicity, and by the enforcement of the laws of our country affecting every company and corporation doing an interstate-commerce transportation business. This will include all railways, all steamboats, all express companies, all pipe lines, all telephone lines, and all telegraph lines, and the Government will be able to make investigations, secure the information, collect the data, and effectually deal with the questions involved through the instrumentalities created in this bill in an intelligent way and a comprehensive manner. [Applause.]

If this bill becomes a law the Government will be in a position to have in its power the agency to gather data, ascertain facts, get information, make investigations, enforce its orders, and prevent evils and wrongs by the strict and speedy execution of the laws now on the statute books, and if those laws are not sufficient to stop the evils complained of by the people, then the Government can recommend to Congress the enactment of additional laws to effectually eradicate every evil in connection with the interstate transportation problem.

Mr. Chairman, in studying this great question I am satisfied that three things are absolutely necessary to be done, at the present time, to effectually deal with the problems arising from the abuses of these interstate transportation systems.

First, there must be a body like the Interstate Commerce Commission, clothed with the right and authority to make just, fair, and reasonable rates in place of unjust, unfair, and unreasonable rates, and have these rates take effect immediately,

and remain in full force and effect until modified or set aside by the Commission; or modified or set aside by the court of last resort. This is an administrative function and should be the sole and only power under the constitutional limitations of our Government conferred on the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Second. There must be a body clothed with authority to determine controversies, review the orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and interpret the laws of Congress governing and regulating transportation. This is a judicial function, and should properly be vested in the courts of our country.

Third. There should be an executive department in the National Government, with a Cabinet officer at its head, charged with the responsibility and the sole duty of the prompt and thorough enforcement of the laws of the United States concerning companies and corporations doing an interstate-commerce business. My bill creates this department. This is an executive function, and belongs to the executive branch of the Government; and these three functions should always be kept separate and distinct.

Now, sir, I think I have stated the proposition broadly and briefly. I have drawn my bill to create such a department in the executive branch of the Government, for the effective and speedy enforcement of the laws governing every company, and every corporation, and every common carrier doing an interstate-commerce business. My plan is in line with the true principles of our institutions from the days of the fathers down to the present time, and when it is adopted by Congress, and it must be adopted sooner or later, it will provide the quickest agency for the proper and speedy execution of the laws against flagrant violations of our statutes; and, to my mind, after mature reflection and careful consideration I believe it will prove an effectual remedy for the principal evils we are trying to check and to stop; and for once and for all time eradicate from the body politic and our system of government the lawless abuses of the great and the powerful interstate-transportation companies of our country. [Loud applause.]

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY.

Stop Fooling the Railway Workmen.

The Republicans vote to suspend the eight-hour law in the Canal Zone, but refuse to allow a vote for the relief of the thousands of railway employees of the country.

This is the one act of legislation above all others that the railroad employees of this country demand, and which they have tried to secure from Congress for the last quarter of a century. In justice to these deserving and heroic men, who daily risk their lives and their limbs in hazardous occupations, it ought to be the law of the land; and, if it were, I unhesitatingly assert that there would be fewer railroad accidents and less loss of life by reason of them every year in the United States.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 6, 1906.



WASHINGTON.
1906.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 12987) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That every common carrier by railroad subject to the provisions of this act shall be liable to any of its employees who are engaged in the transportation of such persons or property, or, in case of his death, to his personal representative or heirs at law, for all damages which may result from the negligence or mismanagement of any of its officers, agents, or employees, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, ways, or works.

That in all actions hereafter brought against any such common carrier by railroad to recover damages for personal injuries to an employee, or where such injuries have resulted in his death, the fact that the employee may have been guilty of contributory negligence shall not bar a recovery where his contributory negligence was slight in comparison to that of the employer.

That no contract of employment, insurance, relief benefit, or indemnity for injury or death entered into by or on behalf of any employee, nor the acceptance of any such insurance, relief benefit, or indemnity by the person entitled thereto, shall constitute any bar or defense to any action brought to recover damages for personal injuries to or death of such employee: *Provided, however,* That upon the trial of such action against any such common carrier by railroad the defendant may set off therein any sum it has contributed toward any such insurance, relief benefit, or indemnity that may have been paid to the injured employee, or, in case of his death, to his heirs at law.

That nothing in this act shall be held to limit the duty of common carriers by railroads or impair the rights of their employees under the safety-appliance act of March 2, 1893, as amended April 1, 1896, and March 2, 1903.

Mr. SULZER. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, speaks for itself, and is offered by me in good faith in the name of the hundreds of thousands of railway employees of the United States.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY.

Under existing law an employee of a railroad company can not recover damages for injuries sustained in the line of his duty by reason of the negligence of the railroad or the carelessness of a fellow-workman. This amendment makes a railroad company or a common carrier liable to the employee, and in case of his death to his heirs at law, in damages for the negligence or mismanagement of any of its officers, agents, or employees, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, ways, or works. This amendment is not new. It is similar to a number of employers' liability bills which have been introduced in every Congress for the past twenty years. It has been indorsed and recommended by the Industrial Commission and by some of the ablest thinkers and jurists and writers in the country. The best thought to-day in the civilized world favors this change in the law applicable to common carriers.

DEMANDED BY THE RAILWAY WORKMEN OF THE COUNTRY.

This amendment is the one act of legislation above all others that the railroad employees of this country demand, and which they have tried to secure from Congress for the last quarter of a century. In justice to these deserving and heroic men, who daily risk their lives and their limbs in hazardous occupations, it ought to be the law of the land; and if it were I unhesitatingly assert that there would be fewer railroad accidents and less loss of life by reason of them every year in the United States.

AN ACT OF JUSTICE.

The amendment is a just measure in the interest of a most worthy and industrious and reliable class of faithful and intelligent workmen. They are entitled to it as a matter of right and in the name of justice. A railroad company, in my judgment, should be held responsible in damages to its employees for its own carelessness and for the negligence of any of its officers or agents, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, ways, or works. I hope this amendment to the pending bill will be accepted and adopted; and I know if it is adopted it will be but

an act of justice to the great army of reliable and industrious workmen of the great transportation companies, and a safeguard against accident and injury to the people generally who ride on the railroads of our country.

THE ENACTMENT OF THIS LAW WOULD DECREASE THE NUMBER OF
RAILROAD ACCIDENTS.

Make the railroads responsible in damages to their employees and take my word for it the railroads will see to it that very few accidents happen. [Applause.] If you will look over the statistics of the country you will find that the number of railroad accidents every year is increasing, the loss of life appalling, and the list of the injured up in the hundred thousand column. Thousands of employees are killed every year by railroad accidents, and tens of thousands are injured and maimed for life through the gross negligence of these interstate-commerce transportation corporations, but on account of this antiquated and unjust and discriminatory law no damages can be recovered, because there is no liability to the railroads.

ABOLISH THE UNJUST FELLOW-SERVANT DOCTRINE.

This old English, antique, fellow-servant doctrine, as applied to the negligence of modern railroads, is eminently unjust, and every fair-minded lawyer who has ever tried a damage suit will tell you the same thing. [Applause.] It is so ridiculous that sixteen foreign states in Europe do not now recognize it, and a majority of our own States in recent years have either abolished or modified it to a great degree. Even autocratic Russia in this regard protects her industrial railroad workers. But our own Government has yet to enact the first line of this kind of desirable legislation demanded by the vast army of patriotic and self-sacrificing railroad employees who are daily giving up their lives and their limbs to the negligence of the transportation corporations of our country.

RAILROAD COMPANIES UNDER CONTROL OF CONGRESS.

Railroad companies by virtue of their interstate character are brought directly under the control of Congress, and therefore it is necessary from a legal standpoint for Congress to enact this law. Several State legislatures have recently met and passed

such laws, but the Republicans in this House—and they have had control of the House for over ten years—have assiduously prevented the passage of this bill; and its enactment seems to be as far off, if not farther, than it was ten years ago. It seems the railroads have more influence here than the people.

NOW IS THE TIME TO BE COUNTED.

But it is said by some of the Republican Members who represent districts in which these railroad employees reside that they are in favor of this legislation and would be glad to vote for it, if they could only get a chance to do so. They say the Judiciary Committee, to which the bill has been referred, will not report it and give them an opportunity to vote for it. This, I say, is the merest subterfuge and no answer to the appeal of these earnest employees for relief. The Republicans can vote now for this amendment, and if it goes out on a point of order, they can vote for a rule to make the amendment germane to the bill. Did they not vote for a rule the other day to abrogate the eight-hour labor law in the Isthmian Canal Zone? Then let them vote to adopt this amendment or for a rule to make it germane to this bill. The Republicans in this House can no longer evade the issue and their responsibility. Now is the time for them to show their colors. Now is the time for them to be counted for or against this just and humane measure. [Applause.] The Republicans in this House are responsible for the failure for the last ten years to pass this bill, and I do not think the intelligent railroad men of the country, who are asking for this just and humane law, will longer permit the Republicans to deceive them regarding their failure to keep their promise made over and over again to enact this bill into law.

REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS FAILED TO KEEP ITS PROMISE.

Sir, since 1896 the Republican party has practically promised the railroad workmen of the country this legislation, but it has absolutely failed to live up to its promise and enact the law. They have ordered several similar bills to the amendment I have just proposed, to be killed in the Judiciary Committee. The Republicans have been in absolute power for the past ten years in all branches of the Government, and I charge that they

have failed and neglected to carry out this promise, or any other promise, heretofore made to the toilers and the working people of the country. Their pledges to the working people have not been redeemed. They will not be redeemed. In passing laws for the workers of the land the Republican Party is long on promise and short on performance. An ounce of performance is worth a ton of promise. I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of the railroad employees of this country, and I sincerely believe that the amendment I propose in their interest, and which is all they ask, is not only just, but it is humane, and it should be granted to them. [Applause.] These faithful employees devote the best years of their lives to the service of large industrial corporations doing an interstate-commerce transportation business, and when they are injured in the line of their duty through the negligence of the corporation, or the carelessness of a fellow employee, they should have the right under the law to recover damages the same as any passenger traveling for hire on the railroad. I say as a lawyer and as a legislator that any other rule is contrary to the spirit of the age. [Applause.]

STOP FOOLING THE RAILWAY WORKMEN.

The wisdom and the justice and the humanity of such a law should be apparent to all, and there is no better time than the present and no better way than the one I suggest to place this just law on the statute books. If the Republicans mean to do what they promised, they will accept my amendment and put it in this bill; if they were simply fooling the railway working people when they promised to pass this measure, they will object to it and rule it out. We shall see ere long how sincere these promising Republicans are. I believe the amendment is germane to the pending legislation; but if it is not, I put the Republicans on notice now, and I suggest that the Republican organization of the House bring in a special rule providing that this proposed amendment in behalf of the railroad employees be made germane to his bill.

REPUBLICANS VOTE TO SUSPEND EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

The Republican organization of the House brought in a special rule the other day to put an amendment on the urgent deficiency

appropriation bill suspending the eight-hour law in the Isthmian Canal Zone. If you can do it in that case, you can do it in this case. Be fair and be honest now with these deserving people. Here is the opportunity to prove your sincerity. The other day the amendment abrogating the eight-hour law was made germane to an appropriation bill quick enough when you wanted to do it, and the eight-hour law was ruthlessly "suspended" without giving the labor representatives an opportunity to be heard before a committee of this House. [Applause.]

LIVE UP TO YOUR PROMISE.

If the Republicans are sincere in regard to their promises to the employees of the great railroad organizations of this country they will put the amendment proposed by me, and just read by the Clerk, into this railroad bill enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It appropriately belongs in this bill. Be honest and do it. The Republican party has promised the railroad working people this law, and I am offering it now as an amendment to this bill, and in my opinion it properly belongs in this bill, to see whether or not the Republicans intend to keep faith with the toilers, and live up to their promise to the working people on the railroads of the United States. If the Republicans are sincere in what they have promised to these industrious working people they will vote to adopt this amendment, but if they simply made that promise to catch the votes of these railway employees then this amendment will not be permitted to go into this bill, but will be stricken out by some Republican raising the point of order; and if the point of order is sustained by the Republican chairman of this committee on the ground that it is not germane to the bill, then I ask again that the Committee on Rules bring in a special order providing that this amendment be made germane to this bill so that every Member can vote on it. [Applause.]

DEMOCRATS FAVOR THE LEGISLATION PROPOSED.

Let us have a record vote and find out the truth. I believe I can safely say that every Democrat on this side of the House will vote for it. If the amendment is not incorporated into this bill it will be because the Republicans do not want it incorporated into the bill; it will be because the Republicans are

insincere and have been fooling the thousands and thousands of working men employed by the great railroads and interstate transportation companies of the country.

A LIGHT TO GUIDE RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

I offer this amendment, and I put to the test the sincerity of the Republicans in this House who promise the working people so much in every political campaign, and who give them so little after the campaign is over and they get back into full power in the legislative branch of the Government. I want to prove by this amendment to the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, to the Brotherhood of Railway Engineers and Firemen, and to the Brotherhood of Railway Employees who are their true friends and who are their real enemies in the Halls of Congress, and the record that will be made on this amendment will be a light to guide railway employees in the future when they come to exercise that greatest of all American privileges—the elective franchise. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

* * * * *

Mr. TOWNSEND (Republican, of Michigan). Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VREELAND, Republican, of New York). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is out of order.

Mr. SULZER. I desire to be heard on the point of order. In my opinion this point of order is untenable. I think this amendment is germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that he has already ruled on this subject and is not inclined to hear further on the point of order.

NIAGARA FALLS.

"This generation must preserve in all its grandeur the magnificent waterfalls at Niagara from the spoliation of sordid commercialism and transmit them unimpaired to future generations."

"This Government must act in this matter, and act at once, before the cunning and piratical hands of utilitarian industrialism destroy this magnificent picture, the greatest scenic wonder ever painted by the unerring hand of the Infinite in the art gallery of nature."

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1906.



WASHINGTON.

1906.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 16953) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As the House of Representatives is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I desire to take advantage of the time at my disposal to say a few words in regard to a matter I deem of much public moment and of vital importance to all the people in our land. I refer to the preservation of one of the greatest scenic wonders in all the world—Niagara Falls.

There are pending in Congress at the present time several bills, any one of which, I believe, if enacted into law, will go far to effectually put a stop for a long time to come to the further devastation of these wonderful waterfalls by the sordid hand of industrialism and the greedy selfishness of commercialism; but thus far, I regret to say, no action has been taken regarding the matter, and I very much fear that unless something is done, and very speedily done, this session of Congress will adjourn without anything being accomplished to protect Niagara Falls from further spoliation.

I appeal to-day to those Members in this House who have in charge this important matter to be up and doing, so that ere we adjourn there will be a law upon the Federal statute books that will make it impossible for any more water for commercial purposes to be diverted from Niagara River—a law that will protect and preserve the beauty and the grandeur of this wonder of wonders, in so far as Congress can do so, for generations yet to come. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the "thunder of waters" of the aborigines, the most awe-inspiring spectacle ever seen by a human being, the promised land of all lovers of natural scenery, the scenic Mecca toward which millions of people travel every year from all parts of the world—the tumultuous, tremendous, thundering Niagara Falls—must not be destroyed, but must be preserved in all its marvelous splendor by this generation for all the ages yet to come. This is our duty. We are charged with this responsibility. We can not and we must not evade it. These Niagara Falls do not belong to any country or to any people. They are the inalienable heritage of humanity, and one generation must preserve them in all their power and in all their beauty for the benefit of the next generation. This is the unwritten law of the eternal rights of mankind, and we must not prove false to our trust or recreant to our responsibility.

The devastation of Niagara Falls is a crime against generations yet unborn, and if we permit the piratical interests of utilitarian industrialism, so rampant in this practicable age, to go on with the spoliation of this magnificent gift of the Creator of the universe, we will be false to the great trust humanity has reposed in us and the future will justly hold us up to obloquy and contempt and execration.

We are the trustees of the free institutions of the fathers and of the natural grandeur and scenic glory of our beautiful land, charged by the sacred rights of mankind to transmit them unimpaired to future generations; and if we fail to preserve and protect the institutions of the fathers, and every beautiful picture in nature's art gallery for those who are to come after us we will be false to our duty, recreant to the solemn trust reposed in us, and justly censurable by those who will follow after us.

Mr. Chairman, the mighty surplus waters of the Great Lakes, as they dash in torrential waves through the narrow confines of Niagara River for 32 miles and then tumultuously plunge in myriad-colored volumes over the precipitous falls of Niagara, is one of the greatest, one of the grandest, and one of the most glorious wonders of the earth—the most awe-inspiring spectacle of its kind little man has ever beheld. You must see it to appreciate it. No tongue can do it justice. No pen can describe it. No painter can picture it. But it is not so much the height of the falls that beggars description—it is the immensity of the volume of water that jumps and leaps and tumbles and rages and roars and thunders over the falls that makes them as unique as they are glorious and indescribable.

The waters of the Great Lakes are discharged through the Niagara River into Ontario, and then on and on oceanward through the St. Lawrence. The mean level of Lake Erie is about 572 feet and that of Lake Ontario about 246 feet above the sea. Leaving Lake Erie at Buffalo the Niagara River is navigable and flows with a moderate slope to a short distance below the Welland River, about 19 miles, in which distance it has a fall of something like 14 feet. The slope here is suddenly increased and the river ceases to be navigable. In the next half mile it has a fall of about 50 feet, forming the rapids above the falls. It is divided by Goat Island into two arms of equal size, that on the Canadian side carrying, it is said, about seven times the volume of water carried on the American side. At the foot of Goat Island the waters of both arms leap over a vertical precipice, constituting Niagara Falls proper, that on the Canadian side being known as the Horseshoe Fall, and that on the American side being called the American Fall. The height of the Horseshoe Fall is about 161 feet, and that of the American Fall about 165 feet. Immediately below the falls the river is again navigable for a short distance, and then assumes the character of magnificent rapids as far as Lewiston, 7 miles from Ontario, where it again becomes navigable and remains so until it enters Lake Ontario.

The volume of water flowing over the falls varies somewhat with the level of Lake Erie, which is subject at times to variations of several feet, depending upon rainfall, barometric pressure, and the direction and force of the wind. At the mean level of Lake Erie the volume of discharge is about 200,000

cubic feet per second. When you come to calculate it, the power of this tremendous volume of water is almost incomprehensible. This gigantic body of water going over these majestic falls every second, and the intensely interesting rapids above and below them, make Niagara Falls a place of indescribable scenery and in uniqueness and grandeur among the seven wonders of the earth.

Years ago the State of New York passed a law creating a beautiful park, consisting of about 400 acres, on the American side; and every year the State appropriates \$25,000 for its care and maintenance. The Canadian government has also created by law a splendid park on the Canadian side, consisting of about 700 acres. And these parks carefully maintained lend additional beauty and enjoyment to the inspiring wonders of nature.

It is said, and investigation demonstrates it, that the falls are receding from natural causes, regardless of commercial desertation, and in the many centuries to come will be only a shadow of their present greatness and glory. In looking over the surveys made by eminent engineers in 1842, 1875, 1886, and 1890, I find that the American Fall has receded at the rate of 0.64 of a foot a year, or 30.75 feet between 1842 and 1890, and the Horseshoe Fall during the same period, 2.18 feet annually, or 104.51 feet in forty-eight years, a very much higher rate of recession than was ever thought of prior to the second survey in 1875. Of course the falls do not recede evenly; some parts of the crest remain more or less stationary, while others change rapidly. The figures I have cited represent the points of greatest activity. According to this data, the total area of rock surface which has disappeared at the American Fall between 1842 and 1890 represents about 33,000 square feet, practically three-fourths of an acre. At the Horseshoe Fall there has disappeared during the same period about 275,000 square feet, or over 6 acres. In all descriptions of the American Fall we speak of one, although there are two, but the second one, called the "Luna Fall," is so small that it is seldom referred to, and is interesting chiefly because it affords the sightseer an opportunity to go behind the falling waters into the so-called "Cave of the Winds."

Geologists have given much study to Niagara Falls, and have speculated as to the future length of life of this incomprehensible marvel of nature, and how many thousands of years it will take before the increasing thickness of the Niagara limestone, and the decreasing exposure of the soft underlying shales will reduce the height of the falls to a mere series of succeeding rapids; but I predict that if the present sordid selfishness of industrial vandalism goes on, it will destroy the unrivaled beauty and diminish the incomparable grandeur of this gigantic water inspiration of the world long before any change is produced by natural erosion.

We can not stop the forces of nature in their unceasing work of destruction, but we can and we must fetter the sordid, selfish, spoliation of man.

The great water power available at Niagara Falls attracted the attention of scheming commercialists at an early day, but it was not until this immense power could be transmitted and used in the form of electricity that its development on a large scale became financially profitable. Within recent years the Canadian government, or the Province of Ontario, and the State

of New York have granted franchises, the value of which can not at this time be computed in figures, to corporations, allowing them to divert the waters from the falls and use its tremendous force for power purposes. There are, I am informed, a half dozen corporations on both sides of the river chartered by the Province of Ontario, or the Canadian government, and the State of New York, and these soulless corporations are doing more to-day to forever destroy these magnificent falls than the forces of nature have done in all the ages of the past.

This Government and Great Britain, acting separately or jointly, must stop this criminal exploitation of the falls for commercial purposes. It is a crime against future generations, and the two Governments concerned ought to take the matter in hand at once and put a stop to it for all time to come. Congress should have done its duty in the premises long ago. These magnificent falls do not belong to the State of New York or to the Canadian government—they belong to the people of all the world; and it is incumbent on this Government and on the British Government to preserve and protect this magnificent wonder of nature and hand it down to future generations with all its beauty unimpaired and all its grandeur undiminished.

We must pass stringent laws to prevent the further granting of franchises to greedy commercial interests by the State of New York, and appeal to the Canadian government to take like action. The franchise heretofore granted by the legislature of the State of New York were granted with few restrictions, and without a single dollar of compensation to the people; and the money-making value of these franchises, if they can not be forfeited, is beyond the calculation of the human mind. The Canadian government, however, more wise and farseeing, did not grant a single franchise without important reservations and full compensation; and I am informed that the tax or revenue the Province of Ontario, or the Canadian government, derives from the franchises heretofore granted to corporations to divert the waters from the falls of Niagara amounts to about \$300,000 annually.

Bills are now pending in the legislature of the State of New York, and in the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario, granting additional franchises to corporations to divert the waters of Niagara, and unless a stop is put to this ruthless and sordid and selfish practice by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain by virtue of a treaty, it will not be so very many years before the beauties of Niagara, the wonders of the falls, and all the grandeur of this inspiring and indescribable painting—the grandest ever placed by the hand of the Infinite in nature's unrivaled scenic gallery—will be no more.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what can the Congress do? What is our duty? How can we put a stop to the further devastation of this magnificent wonder which belongs to all the people of all the world and for all the ages? I answer these questions by saying that the Congress of the United States can put a stop to the further destruction of Niagara Falls so far as the American side is concerned by passing a law making it a crime for any person or corporation to divert any of the waters from the Niagara River for commercial purposes. The Niagara River is a navigable stream, and it being navigable, under the powers of

the Constitution, the laws of Congress in regard to it are supreme. This being so, I contend that the Congress should, without further delay, pass a law along the lines I have indicated, and if this is done it will effectually put a stop to the State of New York granting any more franchises; and I hope that those already granted will be carefully investigated, and wherever possible, abrogated.

But this Government can do more than protect the American side of the falls. It can act through its treaty-making powers. The Niagara River being the boundary between the United States and Canada, the United States and Great Britain have the undoubted right by treaty stipulation to impose such conditions and limitations upon the use of the river and its waters as they deem proper. A treaty duly negotiated between these two powers and ratified by the Senate of the United States would be the supreme law of the land; and if in such treaty it were provided that the waters of Niagara River should not be diverted for commercial purposes and this regulation be enforced by act of Congress the treaty and the legislation would be valid and constitutional—all the rights of the State of New York and of private riparian owners to the contrary notwithstanding. Such a treaty should be quickly negotiated, and I hope it will be. I believe that the President is alive to the real situation, and I trust he will negotiate a treaty with Great Britain at the earliest practicable time to prevent the future spoliation of Niagara Falls. But pending the negotiation of this treaty we, the Members of Congress, have the right and the power to enact legislation as I have suggested that will effectually prevent the further exploitation and devastation of Niagara Falls through the granting of franchises by the legislature of the State of New York. Mr. Chairman, this Government must act in this matter, and act at once, before the cunning and piratical hands of utilitarian industrialism destroy this magnificent picture, the greatest scenic wonder ever painted by the unerring hand of the Infinite in the art gallery of nature. This generation must preserve in all its grandeur the magnificent water falls at Niagara from the spoliation of sordid commercialism and transmit them unimpaired to future generations. If the executive and the legislative branches of this Government will do their duty, and do it quickly, the Falls of Niagara will be saved.

[Loud applause.]

Justice to the Letter Carriers.

I hope the friends of the letter carriers in every Congressional district in the country in the coming Congressional campaign will demand a pledge from the candidates to favor this bill, and vote for the candidate that will promise to work for and support this bill in the next Congress, and vote against the candidate who will not pledge himself to do all in his power to make the bill a law. We will never succeed unless something like this is done.

SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM SULZER, OF NEW YORK, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *Thursday, April 12, 1906.*

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out in lines 1 and 2, page 14, "\$22,228,000" and substitute the following: "\$24,500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for said purpose unless in the use thereof the carriers hereinafter mentioned shall be paid salaries as follows, to wit: That after June 30, 1906, the pay of letter carriers in cities of more than 75,000 population, for the first year of service shall be \$600; for the second year of service shall be \$800; for the third year of service shall be \$1,000; for the fourth year of service and thereafter shall be \$1,200. And after June 30, 1906, the pay of letter carriers in cities of population under 75,000 for the first year of service shall be \$600; for the second year of service, \$800; for the third year of service and thereafter, \$1,000, and that all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that amendment changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order against the amendment. Does the gentleman from New York desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. SULZER. Of course the gentleman from Indiana knows that he can not make a point of order against this proposed substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman has done so. [Laughter.]

Mr. SULZER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will discuss the point of order. In doing so let me say, incidentally, that I substantially agree with all that my colleague from New York [Mr. GOLDFOOLE] has said regarding the efficient and arduous and reliable services performed by these deserving employees of the

Government, the letter carriers, and the inadequacy of the wages they receive for their work.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SULZER. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana that he will get along just as well and just as fast with his bill if he will take things easy.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I merely want to say, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULZER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I merely want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to his remarks of a year or two ago, when he made the same speech.

Mr. SULZER. I have not made the speech yet, but I shall make it every year [laughter], and I will keep on making it as long as I am in Congress, until justice is done to the letter carriers. [Applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. I wanted to know if the gentleman was going to add to that same speech, which he has heretofore delivered, the abuse of myself and the prediction that the letter carriers would see to my retirement, and if he is then going to strike that part of his speech from the Record, as he did before?

Mr. SULZER. I will if you ask me to again.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I never have asked it.

Mr. SULZER. Very well, then I will let it stay in the Record. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I will permit the gentleman to proceed to make his same old speech.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. I do not want the gentleman to make a speech in my time. Let him make his speech in his own time. The gentleman has all the time he wants, and it is very hard for us Democrats over here to get any time at all. Now, I do not intend to indulge in any reflections on the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. It is unnecessary. But I do want him distinctly to understand that if I wanted to state all the facts regarding the outrageous way in which the poor letter carriers are treated and the gentleman's responsibility for it, not only would the gentleman be retired from Congress by his constituents, but every Member of this House who sits here year in and year out and is afraid to show his colors on this question would be retired, too. I hope the friends of the letter carriers in every Congressional district in the country in the coming Congressional campaign will demand a pledge from the candidates to favor this bill, and vote for the candidate that will promise to work for and support this bill in the next Congress, and vote against the candidate who will not pledge himself to do all in his power to make the bill a law. We will never succeed unless something like this is done.

There is not a man in this House who does not know that I am telling the truth when I say that these letter carriers are the hardest worked, the most patient, the most honest, the most zealous, the most untiring, and the most efficient men to-day in the employ of the Government; and yet they get the poorest pay. They are paid to-day just about the same wages they were paid twenty-five years ago, and everybody knows that the price of the necessities of life under the Dingley tariff

law has gone up over 30 per cent during the last ten years, and the letter carriers' wages remain just the same as they were twenty-five years ago. [Applause.]

The letter carriers and the post-office clerks, and every other person whose salary is fixed, do not get any benefit from the Dingley high-tariff law, for nearly all the necessities of life they have to buy now they have to pay about 30 per cent more by reason of this Republican tariff law than they did ten years ago.

The letter carriers ask for a very little more salary, and to have it a graduated salary as provided for in my bill, now offered as an amendment. After a man has worked faithfully several years, give him an increase: after he has served five years, another increase, and so on until the carriers in the large cities of this country—and there are only thirty-nine of them, I believe, with a population of over 75,000—would get \$1,200 a year.

Now, I say \$1,200 a year for a letter carrier who has worked for the Government for years honestly and faithfully, in all kinds of weather, carrying the mail in sunshine and rain, in storm and distress, in the cold of winter and the heat of summer, is little enough. No man can bring up his family and educate his children on any less. I know there are letter carriers in the city of New York who do not dare get married because they know that they can not earn enough to decently support a wife. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by me and just read by the Clerk is in the interest of the letter carriers of our country. It is their bill, their hope—the one thing in legislation they ask for, and pray for, and demand. I offer it in good faith in their name, and under our rules I do not think it is, or can be, subject to a point of order.

This amendment is the letter carriers' bill introduced by me in this House at the beginning of this Congress. I have introduced this letter carriers' bill in every Congress for the past ten years. It never gets out of the committee of the gentleman from Indiana. It is there now. It is sleeping in that committee, and it will never wake up—never come out. I am satisfied the Republicans on the Post-Office Committee will never report it favorably. The bill is so short that I will ask the indulgence of the House while I read it. Besides, I want it to go in the RECORD as part of my remarks, so that all who are concerned in the matter can read it and judge of its merit. I introduced it in this House on the 13th day of last December. It is entitled "A bill to increase the pay of letter carriers," and reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after June 30, 1906, the pay of letter carriers in cities of more than 75,000 population for the first year of service shall be \$600; for the second year of service shall be \$800; for the third year of service shall be \$1,000; for the fourth year of service and thereafter shall be \$1,200. And after June 30, 1906, the pay of letter carriers in cities of a population of under 75,000 for the first year of service shall be \$600; for the second year of service, \$800; for the third year of service and thereafter, \$1,000.

Sec. 2. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

That is all there is to it—a most commendable bill. Why should it not be reported? Why should it be smothered in the committee? Why should it not be presented to the House and

the Members given an opportunity to vote for it or against it? We want a record on this bill. We want to fix responsibility. We want to find out who are the friends and who are the enemies of the letter carriers. I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of the letter carriers. I am proud to say that. They are my friends and I am their friend. The Government in all its service has no more honest, no more tireless, no more faithful employees. Their claims are just and should be recognized, and sooner or later they will be recognized and granted. So keep up the fight.

These letter carriers are the most efficient, the hardest worked in all the country's service, and the poorest paid. The letter carriers of the land are compelled to toil day in and day out—in sunshine and in storm, in winter and in summer, in all kinds of weather—long, long weary hours, and taking all other employees in the various Departments of the Federal Government as a basis for comparison, it can not be denied that the letter carriers render the most and the hardest work for the smallest remuneration. Let us be just to these honest, hard-working, faithful men.

Now, sir, why is it when every Democrat, I believe, on this side of the House is anxious for a favorable report of this bill, is anxious to have it passed, is anxious to vote for it to make it a law—why is it, I ask, that the Republicans in this House smother the bill every session in the committee? Why is the Republican party against the letter carriers' bill? Is it because a few Republican leaders of this House are opposed to giving the letter carriers decent wages? Or is it because the Republicans are so busy legislating for monopoly that they have no time to legislate for man? Let the Republican party answer in the coming campaign.

Now, sir, I want to state that in every Congress in which I have been a Member I have introduced this letter carriers' bill for the benefit of the letter carriers. During all this time I have worked as hard as I could, before the committee, with Members of the House, in season and out of season, continually, to get a favorable report, but all in vain. I never could get the Republicans on the committee to report the bill and do justice to the deserving letter carriers of the country. Time and time again on the floor of this House, year in and year out, I have pleaded for just treatment, decent wages, and fair play for the letter carriers. If there ever was a bill introduced in this House that ought to appeal to every Member as a matter of right and justice it is my bill for the letter carriers.

I plead to-day, as I have pleaded in the past, for justice for the deserving letter carriers. Their request for living wages is the demand of humanity. My heart goes out to them. I can not refrain from making this appeal in their behalf for simple justice. How I wish it were in my power to aid them, to pass and enact into law this bill they all want, they all pray for; this bill that is so fair and so just, that appeals to every right-thinking citizen in all the land, and that challenges adverse criticism. How much time and money we waste here for useless and worthless things! It is terrible when one soberly considers it all—and then, again, so much for the few, so little for the many. How easy for the monopolies and the powerful to pass a bill—a bad bill—and how difficult for the poor and the weak, the many, to pass a bill—a good bill. [Applause.]

How poorly, how miserably the letter carriers are paid! And yet, take them all in all, they are courteous, long suffering, uncomplaining, honest, assiduous, and industrious. How few of our citizens ever think of their trials, their wants, their health, and their families and little ones at home. Under the present law they do not, and can not, earn enough, no matter how long they have been in the service of the Government or how many hours a day they labor, to keep body and soul together. And what do they get? A mere pittance a month that is not enough to economically support one man. It is a disgrace, a crying shame. Many of these letter carriers have wives and children—little homes—and these wives and children in many cases are to-day in want.

The head of the household does not get paid enough by the Government to live halfway decently. But it is not the Government's fault, it is the fault of the Republican leaders here in Congress. I want to appeal to the Republicans of this House, in the name of justice and fair play, in the name of decency, that when they are doing so much for organized capital, so much for criminal syndicates, so much for monopolies, for God's sake to do something for the poor letter carriers. [Applause.]

Let us be honest. Let us be just. Let us be true to the dictates of our nobler impulses, and if we are, this amendment—the letter carriers' bill, so honest and so just and so earnestly desired—will be adopted, speedily passed, and a law on our statute books. Is there a man here opposed to it? If so, let him come out in the open and have the courage to get up and say so. Do not strike it down and out on a technical point of order. Who is opposed to this amendment on its merits? If any there be, let him get up and say so. I pause for an answer. No one opposed to it, and yet the bill lies in the committee, and it seems impossible to ever get it out.

The friends of the letter carriers in this House can not get the letter carriers' bill reported from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. Under our rules we can not move to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. Our only remedy, our last resort, is to move to amend this post-office appropriation bill by offering the letter carriers' bill as an amendment, and draw the amendment in such a way that it will not be subject to a point of order, which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], the chairman of the committee, always makes to every effort that is made to aid and benefit the letter carriers. He gladly and quickly and yearly increases the appropriations for the railroads for carrying the mails, but he inhumanly and stubbornly, year in and year out, refuses to increase the appropriation for the letter carriers for carrying the mail. Everything for soulless monopoly; nothing for flesh-and-blood man. What a contrast! What a spectacle! What a shame! [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have now made my old speech, as the gentleman from Indiana says, for the letter carriers. I shall not at present discuss the matter further. But I shall continue the fight for justice to the letter carriers until the battle is won.

Now, sir, just a word in regard to the point of order made by the gentleman from Indiana. I do not think the amendment is subject to a point of order; it is a limitation on the appropri-

tion. It has been held over and over again that a limitation of this character on an appropriation is in order. I believe I am sustained by precedent. We shall have a vote on the amendment. I want to get a vote here to-day on my amendment to see how many Members of this House are in favor of doing justice to the letter carriers. I regret to see that there are so many empty chairs around. I am sorry that Members knowing this question was coming up stay away or go out in the lobby, and then tell the people at home who ask for justice for the letter carriers, who want their bill passed, that they are in favor of it, but they can not get a vote on it. Now, I am going to give the Members present the opportunity to vote for it. About one-third of the membership of the House is out of the House, and yet every one of the Members knew that this question was coming up to-day. However, I am willing to take the judgment of the Members that are here, and I hope every man who is in favor of decent wages being paid by the Government for faithful service will vote in favor of the amendment I have offered.

In regard to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, made by the gentleman from Indiana on this amendment, I desire to call the Chair's attention to page 3529 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 22, 1904, when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] was in the Chair, and he ruled on an identical amendment and declared that it was in order.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say that while the amendment as drawn is under the limitation, it necessarily changes the law even for one year, and when it does change the law for any length of time, however slight, it violates the rule, and I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A moment ago, in deciding a point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNETT], the Chair very briefly attempted to distinguish between the present condition and the condition that existed heretofore in reference to limitation. The same conditions are present now by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], and the Chair, for the same reason, sustains the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SULZER. Do I understand the Chair to overrule the decision of Judge CRUMPACKER?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. SULZER. And I desire to be heard briefly on the appeal.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I object. It is not subject to debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman from Indiana should learn parliamentary law when he goes home. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will be heard on the appeal.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom and always with regret that I appeal from the decision of the Chair, es-

pecially when the Chair is occupied by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], whom I look upon as one of the best parliamentarians in Congress. But in this instance I am constrained to do so because I fear the Chair, who has just been selected by his party as chairman of the Republican Congressional committee, has for some reason or other—and we must draw our own conclusion—overruled a precedent that should be followed in this House. I thought the Chairman was such a good friend of the letter carriers that he would follow that precedent heretofore made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Now, sir, this identical amendment, to go no further back than two years ago, when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] was in the chair, was presented by an amendment offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. Livernash. Judge CRUMPACKER, in his decision (p. 3529 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), said:

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California is to strike out the phrase "twenty-two million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars" * * * and substitute therefor "twenty-three million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation shall be used for said purpose unless in the use thereof the letter carriers hereinafter mentioned shall be paid salaries as follows."

The language of my amendment is identical with this phraseology. The two amendments are on all fours. Judge CRUMPACKER goes on to say:

The Chair reads only enough of the amendment to illustrate its character. * * *

The business of the House is conducted under rules adopted by the House; and it is within the power of the House to withhold an appropriation altogether or to make it and connect with it limitations. * * * The House has that power, and the Chair has no right to say the House can not exercise it.

The House has the undoubted right to impose limitations upon appropriations and impose conditions by way of limitation. * * *

It is not for the Chair to criticize the action of the House, but simply to decide whether, under the rules, it has the right to adopt the proposed amendment. The Chair is of the opinion it has that right, and therefore overrules the point of order. * * *

The entire matter was thoroughly debated at that time by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] and by several gentlemen on the floor, and after a full and careful discussion of the proposition Judge CRUMPACKER ruled against the point of order.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is very easy to override and overrule an established precedent; but I say, and I have had some experience as a presiding officer, I say there is nothing so dangerous in the history of parliamentary practice and of parliamentary assemblages, as to have chairmen, or speakers, one year rule one way and the next year rule another way on an identical proposition. If that is to go on in this House, no man who is a Member of it will be able to tell if a question arises where he stands, or what his rights are, or what he can do under the rules. He will be simply at the mercy of the arbitrary will and autocratic power of the gentleman who happens to be in the chair. We must follow precedent. If this House permits this decision to be set aside in this way, I predict that the time is not far distant when the House of Representatives of the United States will be the laughingstock of every parliamentary body in the world. I believe in following

precedents, especially when I believe they are right and in accordance with good parliamentary practice.

As a Member of this House for ten years I have never voted to override the decision of the Chair when in my opinion the Chair was right. I believe the decision of the gentleman now in the chair is wrong, against precedent and good parliamentary practice. I shall not waste time in further discussing it. I submit this question to the House, and declare that if it sustains the Chairman and overrides the precedent heretofore made, I will submit the case of the rights of the letter carriers to the people in the coming Congressional campaign and let them decide between Philip drunk and Philip sober. [Applause.]

The question was taken on the appeal; and there were—ayes, 128, noes 14.

So the decision of the Chair stood as the judgment of the House.

NATIONAL AID IN THE BUILDING
OF GOOD ROADS.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

SATURDAY, JUNE 9, 1906.



WASHINGTON.

1906.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 19844) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: While we are considering this sundry civil appropriation bill, which legislates out of the Treasury millions and millions of dollars annually of the people's money for all sorts of purposes and conditions of things—except the one I am going to talk about—I desire to call to the attention of the Members of this House a matter that I consider of much moment to all the people, and of far-reaching importance to the general welfare of the entire country—I refer to the construction of good roads as an aid to national progress.

Let me say that I have given this matter of national good highways careful study and considerable investigation, and I believe it is one of the most important questions now before the American people.

From time immemorable good road building has been one of the leading factors in advancing civilization, and it is a matter for general congratulation that the country is again earnestly urging the necessity, from an economic standpoint, of better roadways, and that we are all beginning to realize the industrial advantages that are sure to follow the construction of better transportation facilities throughout the land.

The appeal for good roads is a patriotic demand that comes to us from every section of the land—from our most intelligent and far-sighted and disinterested citizens—and I assert that the time is at hand when the Congress of the United States

must take up the matter seriously and legislate intelligently on the subject. The question will not down, and it can not much longer be ignored. The people want it, and what the people want they generally get. As President Roosevelt recently said:

Merely from the standpoint of historical analogy we should have a right to ask that this people which has tamed a continent, which has built up a country with a continent for its base, which boasts itself with truth as the mightiest Republic that the world has ever seen, which we firmly believe will in the century now opening rise to a position of headship and leadership such as no other nation has ever yet attained—merely from historical analogy, I say, we should have a right to demand that such a nation build good roads. Much more have we a right to demand it from the practical standpoint. The difference between the semibarbarism of the middle ages and the civilization which succeeded it was the difference between poor and good means of communication. And we, to whom space is less of an obstacle than ever before in the history of any nation; we who have spanned a continent, who have thrust our border westward in the course of a century and a quarter until it has gone from the Atlantic over the Alleghenies, down into the valley of the Mississippi, across the Great Plains, over the Rockies to where the Golden Gate lets through the long-heaving waters of the Pacific; we, who take so little account of mere space, must see to it that the best means of nullifying the existence of space are at our command.

I agree with the President in what he has said concerning this matter, and I hope ere long he will send to the Congress a special message urging us to take some immediate and definite action regarding Government aid to good road building throughout the United States. The fathers of the Republic wisely recognized the importance of this question. Washington and Jefferson advocated good roads and projected the construction of the great highway from the capital to the Mississippi Valley. The far-seeing statesmen of the early days of our national existence championed and passed measures to better the means of transportation. They knew that of all human agencies the one which has done most for humanity and civilization has been the building of good roads—the abridgment of distance in the facility of communication. They realized the necessity of good roads—how important they were to the country—to its growth and its development, and to mankind, morally, physically, intellectually, and industrially, removing national and provincial antipathies and binding together all the branches of the great human family.

Mr. Chairman, we appropriate a great deal of money every year for the Army. That is necessary. I am a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I have always been liberal to the boys in blue—to the brave and heroic soldiers of our country. We appropriate upward of \$100,000,000 every year for the Navy; and I am, and always have been, a friend of our gallant and glorious Navy, which has illumined with its immortal achievements every page of American history. We spend millions annually for pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Union, and that is entirely just and proper, and in accordance with the solemn promise of the country. We vote a great deal of money every year for public buildings and grounds, and a stately Federal structure adorns almost every city in the land. We appropriate millions and millions of dollars for fortifications and coast defenses—no doubt necessary. The Government has spent thus far over \$500,000,000 for river and harbor improvements, and at times, since I have been a Member of this House, I have felt impelled to oppose some of these appropriations because I believed in certain instances they were unnecessary and extravagant. But in more than fifty years we have not appropriated a dollar for good roads for our common highways. The record will demonstrate, I think, that there is appropriated annually a great deal of money from the pockets of the taxpayers for purposes that bring very little material return or lasting benefit to the rank and file of the people of the country.

I call attention to these vast annual expenditures of money by way of contrast—and we are a country of great contrasts—to show how important to the men and women of the land to-day is the proposition for the building of good roads for their own use and benefit, and for the progress and the prosperity of our expanding Republic—the greatest the sun of noon has ever smiled upon in all the annals of the past. [Applause.]

Now, sir, I declare that the history of civilization demonstrates that the rise of great governments and the growth of powerful dynasties were coincident with the construction of good roads and the resulting facility of communication and transportation. The Romans were the greatest road builders

the world has ever seen, and the highways they built in the palmy days of their greatness constitute the most lasting monument to their constructive genius; and the marvelous thing about it all is that these roads are practically just as good to-day as they were when they were built. The far-sighted wisdom of Julius Cæsar built from the imperial exchequer the magnificent roads that led from all directions to eternal Rome. The great Napoleon—Cæsar like—built the roads of France that center in Paris from the general funds of the Government, and these French roads have done more than any other single agency to encourage the thrift and increase the industry and insure the contentment of the people of France. Cæsar and Napoleon were the great road builders of the modern world, and their foresight and their judgment demonstrated the beneficent results that follow, as the night the day, the construction of governmental highways.

England's good roads are to-day famous. They were not always so. Let me read to you what a celebrated English author said about Britain's bad roads less than a century ago. Macaulay, writing of the condition of the public roads of England previous to 1835, says :

The fruits of the earth were sometimes suffered to rot in one place, while a few miles distant the supplies fell short of the demand. One chief cause of the badness of the roads was the defective state of the law. Every parish was bound to repair the roads which passed through it, and thus a sparse and impoverished population was often compelled to maintain highways between rich and populous towns.

Then came Telford and Macadam—the great road builders of Britain. They pointed out the cause of stagnation and decay; they fought and agitated for good roads by parliamentary appropriations; they predicted the beneficent results sure to follow the construction of better highways; and through their foresight and endeavors England has to-day good roads from one end of her domain to the other—as good as any thoroughfares in all the world.

The United States must build and possess good roads. The General Government must lend its aid to their construction. They must be free to all the people and stretching away in all directions throughout the length and the breadth of the land. It

is essential to our development. We are the greatest and the grandest and the richest Republic in all the ages, and only on the threshold of our glorious destiny; but yet, I am sorry to say, we are far behind the other great governments of the world in the construction and maintenance of good roads. Every person who has traveled abroad is at once impressed with this unfortunate fact. It is a reflection on our energy, a sad commentary on our sagacity, and a humiliating comparison with our progressive enterprise in every other field of endeavor. We must not lag behind the European states in this important matter; and yet, if we start now, it will take us years and years to equal the good roads of continental governments and distant oriental countries.

Good roads, sir, are the arteries of the industrial life of a great and powerful people. In a Government such as ours, all sorts and conditions of men and women are more or less absolutely dependent upon the best and speediest means of communication and transportation. If you say good roads will only help the farmers, I deny it. The farmers, who produce the necessities of life, are less dependent than the millions and millions of people who live in our cities and towns. The most superficial investigation of this subject will clearly prove that good roads are just as important to the consumers, if not more so, than they are to the producers of the country.

Now, it may be claimed by some unthinking individual that the railroads answer all requirements, or at least have decreased the need of good roads. Let us see. Last year it cost about \$1,850,000,000 to transport the products of the country over dirt roads to the nearest shipping point, while the railroads received, all told, in gross receipts, from every source for the same period of time, considerably less; so that it will readily be perceived that the railroad systems fall far short of supplying the transportation needs of the people; and besides the difference in the cost of transporting freight over good roads and bad roads is enormous as it is startling. The statistics show it costs about 25 cents a ton a mile, on an average, to transport merchandise over the dirt roads of the United States, and that the average cost over the improved roads of twenty

European states is less than 10 cents a ton a mile. Here is a difference of over a billion dollars a year between the cost of transportation over good roads and bad roads, and every dollar of it to-day comes out of the pockets of the toilers and producers of America and is a dead financial loss. The difference in cost of transportation by steam, horsepower, and electricity over the highways of the United States is illustrated by the following table, based on the most careful estimates, which shows how far \$1.25 will go to pay for transporting a ton of freight in four different ways:

Cost of transportation per ton.

Horsepower, 5 miles-----	\$1. 25
Electric power, 25 miles-----	1. 25
Steam cars, 250 miles-----	1. 25
Steamships on the Lakes, 1,000 miles-----	1. 25

Now, sir, in this connection I want to read a brief extract from an eloquent speech delivered last year by Hon. William J. Bryan before the annual convention of the National Good Roads Association. Mr. Bryan said:

I have become exceedingly interested in this subject. * * * The expenditure of money for the permanent improvement of the common roads can be defended, first, as a matter of justice to the people who live in the country; second, as a matter of advantage to the people who do not live in the country; and, third, on the ground that the welfare of the nation demands that the comforts of country life shall, as far as possible, keep pace with the comforts of city life.

It is a well-known fact, or a fact easily ascertained, that the people in the country, while paying their full share of the Federal taxes, receive, as a rule, only the general benefits of government; while the people in the cities have, in addition to the protection of the Government, the advantages arising from the expenditure of public moneys in their midst. The farmer not only pays his share of the taxes, but more than his share; yet very little of what he pays gets back to him. * * * The farmer has nothing that escapes taxation. The improvement of the country roads can be justified also on the ground that the farmer, the first and most important producer of wealth, ought to be in position to hold his crop and market it at the most favorable opportunity, whereas at present he is virtually under compulsion to sell it as soon as it is matured, because the roads may become impassable at any time during the fall, winter, or spring. The farmer has a right to insist upon roads that will enable him to go to town, church, schoolhouse, and to the homes of his neighbors, as occasion may require; and with the extension of the rural delivery he has an additional need for good roads in order that he may be kept in communication with the outside world.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with what Mr. Bryan has so well said. The farmer gets very little benefit from the General Govern-

ment and is taxed on everything. The burdens of life fall hardest on the farmer. The least the Government can do for him is to help him get decent highways. I am with the farmers in this fight for good roads. I am with the rural districts of our land in their struggle for better transportation facilities, and in Congress or out of Congress I shall do all in my power to hasten the consummation they desire—the ability to go and come along decent roads without exhausting the time and the effort and the utility of man and beast. I know farm life. My boyhood days were spent on a farm doing farm work. I know the farmer's joys and sorrows—his trials and his troubles and his triumphs. We owe much to the farmers and producers of our country—much that we can never repay. Whatever will aid them will benefit the people in every community.

To-day I represent in Congress a great district in the very heart of the city of New York—a great, patriotic people, of whom I am justly proud—but I am broad-minded enough and farseeing enough to realize that what will help one part of our country will benefit every other section of our land, and I deprecate the narrow view that is often expressed concerning the local character of this important question of good-road building. It is not local or sectional. It is national in all its aspects; it is for the public weal; it will promote the general welfare, and the Government should give its legislative sanction to the project and render all the aid within its power. I say it is the duty of the Federal Government to lend our rural population a helping hand to remove the curse of bad roads. [Applause.]

I am glad to note that there is revival of interest all along the line in the making of good roads. The Government at the present time is committed to the policy of highway improvements and the construction of good roads in Porto Rico, in the Hawaiian Islands, and in the Philippines. We are spending millions and millions of dollars every year for the building of good roads in our insular possessions, but not one dollar for the same purpose in our own continental country. Let us keep up the fight for good roads at home, ever bearing in mind that no country now enjoys good roads without governmental aid in their construction.

Good road building is a public matter, a national necessity, and it closely concerns the general welfare of the whole country. I am in favor of Government aid in the construction of good roads for all the people. [Applause.] These roads will be postal highways for the delivery of the mails, military channels in case of war, the great arteries of interstate commercial life, and the avenues through which the chariot of progress shall drive ever and anon, bringing the products of plenty to the rich and the poor alike and untold benefits to all the land for ages yet to come.

Speaking on the subject of good roads and national greatness, Gen. Nelson A. Miles said recently :

I know of no one element of civilization in our country that has been more neglected than the improvement of our roads, yet this is the element that marks the line between barbarism and civilization in any country. The founders of our Government strongly advocated the necessity of opening up and improving the means of internal communication. The immortal Washington retired from the pomp and circumstance of glorious war to occupy the honorable position of a sovereign citizen, and while conducting the affairs of his plantation was president of a transportation company. The author of the Declaration of Independence, the founder of one of our great universities and the eminent statesman who gave to us this vast empire west of the Mississippi, was right when he said in a letter addressed to Humboldt :

"It is more remunerative, splendid, and noble for the people to spend money on canals and roads that will build and promote social intercourse and commercial facilities than to expend it on armies and navies." He was right again when he said, in a letter to James Ross : "I experience great satisfaction in seeing my country proceed to facilitate intercommunication of several parts by opening rivers, canals, and roads. How much more rational is this disposition of public money than that of waging war."

How true are the words of immortal Jefferson regarding the disposition of public money. We appropriate millions and millions of dollars every year for war—not a dollar for peace. We spend millions and millions of dollars annually for the improvement of our rivers, and not a dollar for the improvement of our roads. We have neglected this important work too long. It is all to our shame. Let us begin ; let us follow in the footsteps of the builders of the Republic, and commence now to do something to improve our national roadways. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the House to a bill I introduced in Congress to promote the building of good Government roads. It is H. R. 19470, introduced by me on May 18, 1906, and entitled "A bill to promote good roads and the efficiency of the postal service in the States and Territories of the United States." It is a very short bill, and I send it to

the Clerk's desk to be read in my time, so that it will go in the RECORD and be a part of my speech.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to promote the construction of good roads and the efficiency of the postal service in the States and Territories of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the application of the proper authorities representing any State or Territory of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury shall loan to such State or Territory for the construction or improvement of post-roads within such State or Territory and outside the limits of any city or incorporated village the actual cost of such construction or improvement: *Provided*, That the construction or improvement of said post-roads shall be under the general supervision of the Post-Office Department and according to specifications approved by it, and the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized and directed to make all needful rules and regulations relating thereto: *Provided further*, That one twenty-fifth part of all money received from the United States Government under the provisions of this act shall be each year returned to the Treasury of the United States by the State or Territory receiving the same until the whole amount received by such State or Territory shall have been returned.

SEC. 2. That no interest shall be charged upon money loaned under the provisions of this act when return to the Treasury is promptly made as provided for by this act, but a 5 per cent per annum interest charge shall be added to all deferred payments. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make all necessary arrangements with the States and Territories with respect to the said loan.

SEC. 3. That the President is directed to cause to be laid before Congress, as soon as convenience will permit after the commencement of each session, a statement of all proceedings under this act.

SEC. 4. That this act shall take effect immediately.

Mr. SUIZER. Mr. Chairman, that bill speaks for itself. It is a short bill, a concise bill, and to my mind it embodies a most comprehensive plan for the building of good roads throughout the country by Government aid, and yet ultimately it will not take one dollar from the Treasury of the United States. This bill of mine provides a simple way and an expedient plan to accomplish immediate better governmental highway construction. In a nutshell, the bill authorizes the General Government to loan its surplus money without interest to the States and Territories to build good roads, the work to be done under the general supervision of the Post-Office Department and in accordance with its rules and regulations, and the money thus loaned to be repaid to the Government in small annual installments. The bill is not subject to constitutional objection, for the reason that under its provisions the States and Territories borrow the

money, furnish the right of way, and are required to protect and maintain the roads after they are built. None of the powers of the States are interfered with in any way. It is Government cooperation, and the right of the Government to loan its surplus money to aid in the construction of good roads for all the people has been held over and over again to be constitutional. This plan of mine is as simple as it is feasible.

My bill may not be perfect—I am willing to change it if anyone can suggest an amendment to make it better—but I believe it is far-reaching in its possibilities for immediate and economical good-road building. Its object is plain. It will build the roads, give us better postal facilities, cheapen transportation, keep money in circulation, give employment to the idle workmen of the country, initiate the undertaking demanded by the people, restore to life every languishing local industry, market the products of our producers, aid our commerce, increase our wealth, extend our prosperity, solve the problem, and give our country the best highways in all the world in less than twenty-five years, without in the end actually costing the Federal Government a single dollar.

Mr. Chairman, let me assure all my colleagues that I have no vanity in this matter. I am seeking results—the speedy accomplishment of the thing desired. I want to say that I am wedded to no particular plan for governmental improvement of our national highways, although I think my bill is by far the simplest, the most practicable, and the most comprehensive proposition which has thus far been presented to bring about Congressional action for the building of good roads; and I submit the measure to the candid consideration of the people of the country, who are thinking about and investigating this subject, in order that they may study it and approve it if they think it is an honest and a just way to aid in the establishment of good avenues of transportation from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf; and I submit it to the Members of Congress, hoping that they will study its practicability and take some action on the bill in the very near future. I have no ambition in this matter save to serve the people and comply with their wishes. As I said, I am simply

seeking to accomplish results. I am in favor of good roads. I know it is an impossibility for the counties or the States of the Union to build good roads without some help from the National Government. My plan is to have the Government aid the States and Territories by loaning them, in the first instance, the money to build these good roads and let the States pay back the money in small annual installments. In this way we will soon have good roads without finally depleting the National Treasury a single dollar, because every dollar which will be spent from the National Treasury will come back again. I know there are other bills pending in Congress in regard to this matter, and I know that there have been bills pending in Congress for years and years seeking to do something for the construction of good roads, but thus far not one of these bills has ever been favorably acted upon.

In my opinion, there can be no serious objection to the provisions of my bill, and I believe if it should become a law the whole problem would be solved, and in less than a quarter of a century we would have the grandest highways that exist in all the world, and it would do more than any other single agency I can think of to develop our resources, benefit all our people, and make us greater and grander and more prosperous in a commercial and industrial way. [Applause.]

Sir, the people of the country know the importance of good road building. They are familiar with the truths of history. They know the past. They realize that often the difference between good roads and bad roads is the difference between profit and loss. Good roads have a money value far beyond our ordinary conception. Bad roads constitute our greatest drawback to internal development and material progress. Good roads mean prosperous farmers; bad roads mean abandoned farms, sparsely settled country districts, and congested, populated cities, where the poor are destined to become poorer. Good roads mean more cultivated farms and cheaper food products for the toilers in the towns; bad roads mean poor transportation, lack of communication, high prices for the necessities of life, the loss of untold millions, and idle workmen seeking employment. Good roads will help those who cultivate the

soil and feed the multitude, and whatever aids the producers of our country will increase our wealth and our greatness and benefit all the people of the land. We can not destroy our farms without general decay and final deterioration. They are to-day the heart of our national life and the chief source of our material greatness. Tear down every edifice in our towns and labor will rebuild them, but abandon the farms and our cities will crumble away and disappear forever.

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I appeal to you in the name of patriotism, for our common weal, for our commercial supremacy, in the name of 20,000,000 of our fellow-citizens, to do something, and do it quickly, for good roads; lend the States the money; begin the construction; put the unemployed to work, and a grateful and responsive people will rise up and call you blessed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in conclusion, that I take an abiding interest in this all-absorbing question for better highways throughout the land by some plan of governmental assistance. I am for the cause, and in the fight to stay. I am now, always have been, and always will be, a friend of good road building. It means progress and prosperity, a benefit to the people who live in the cities, and an advantage to the people who live in the country, and it will help every section of our vast domain. Good roads, like good streets, make habitation along them most desirable; they enhance the value of farm lands, facilitate transportation, and add untold wealth to the producers and consumers of the country; they are the milestones marking the march of civilization; they economize time and labor and money; they save wear and tear and worry and waste; they beautify the country, bring it in touch with the city, and aid the social and religious and educational and industrial advancement of the people; they make better homes and happier hearth-sides; they are the avenues of trade, the highways of commerce, the mail routes of information, and the agencies of speedy communication; they mean the economical transportation of marketable products—the maximum burden at the minimum cost; they are the ligaments that bind the country together in thrift and industry and intelligence and

patriotism; they promote social intercourse, prevent intellectual stagnation, and increase the happiness and the prosperity of our producing masses; they contribute to the glory of the country, give employment to our idle workmen, distribute the necessaries of life—the products of the fields and the forests and the factories—encourage energy and husbandry, inculcate love for our scenic grandeur, and make mankind better and greater and grander. Good roads have made the glory of the nations of the past, and good roads will add to our greater glory and make us all that we hope to be. the most beneficent power that ever blessed an advancing and progressive humanity. [Loud applause.]

6877

O

WHAT ORGANIZED LABOR DEMANDS.
THE TOILERS' PLEA FOR LEGISLATIVE JUSTICE.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

JUNE 29, 1906.



WASHINGTON.
1906.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

The House, as in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 14606) to provide for the consolidation and reorganization of customs collection districts, and for other purposes—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I addressed the House at some length on a previous occasion on the subject of an eight-hour law. In my remarks then I made the following statement, which has not been challenged:

No measure in recent years has been so stubbornly resisted by organized greed as the heroic efforts of organized labor to place upon the statute books of the country this humane bill making eight hours a legal day's work. Over a month ago the minority of the Committee on Labor stole a march on the majority of the committee and ordered a favorable report of this bill, but the chairman of the committee neglected to make the report in accordance with the instructions of a majority of a quorum of the Committee on Labor until the day before yesterday. Then the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GARDNER], the chairman of the Committee on Labor, reluctantly filed a report, knowing that it would be too late for the bill to pass the House this session and become a law. He held back the report in violation of every rule and every precedent until a couple of days before the time he knew the Congress was going to adjourn.

I repeat it now, and I charge the Republicans with the responsibility for the defeat of the eight-hour law. So much for that.

Equally futile have been all the attempts of the Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee to obtain action of any kind on the Pearre anti-injunction bill. After months of time-killing, tedious discussions, and near the close of the session, certain points that had been fully discussed and fully considered, and upon which every member had made up his mind, were referred to a subcommittee of three, the two Republican members of which had already committed themselves on the record against the bill. That subcommittee is directed to report at the next session. It is noted that the election for the Sixtieth Congress will then have been held. Men may be excused for opposing a labor bill openly and from the standpoint of an honest belief, but who does not despise a cowardly evasion? No one should receive a workingman's vote for a seat in this body who is not willing to place himself of record for or against labor's demands on the floor of the House, or by other act equally solemn and unequivocal.

Of more far-reaching importance would be a change in the practice in the Federal courts to limit the use of injunctions.

On this subject I insert an extract from the argument of Thomas Carl Spelling, esq., of New York, attorney for the American Federation of Labor, made before the Judiciary Committee, which appears to be peculiarly appropriate:

The framers of the Constitution, according to all interpretations, took care that bounds should be set to equitable jurisdiction. It has universally been held that the equitable powers are those, and those only, that were possessed by the English judges at the time the colonies separated. But these judges single out a class in the community and stretch forth the hand of arbitrary power to that class exclusively.

Rome changed from a republic to an empire by abuse on the part of the tribunes of power to enjoin. First, they used it to forbid, next to command; then came the emperor. The next use of the power may be to forbid competition. The doctrine that a right to do business is property is dangerous. The Roman tribunes of course abused this power, as all unusual and inordinate power will be abused; and the people, unable to return to former conditions because the Roman employers' associations opposed and exerted an undue influence in the Roman Senate, cried out, "Ave imperator!" Then arose Carl the Great, first Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the middle ages. Thus extension and usurpation of the power to enjoin ripened into the undisputed power of one man to legislate, adjudicate, and execute.

By the ancient and startling example above cited every American citizen should be forewarned. The abuses of power, the usurpations by the courts, are increasing both in flagrancy and number; and unless checked by legislation workingmen will soon find themselves reduced to a condition of abject servitude, retaining barely the privileges to breathe and toil for such pittance as are reluctantly doled out to them by their task-masters.

These, sir, and other matters of growing interest to labor have been ruthlessly thrust aside by the Republican majority at this and prior sessions. Some of them are set forth in labor's bill of grievances, which has been presented to the persons named therein, but without avail. I now insert the bill of grievances, containing a clear and succinct statement of labor's just demands and of Republican indifference with respect thereto.

LABOR'S GRIEVANCES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 21, 1906.

HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States;

HON. WM. P. FRYE,
President pro tempore United States Senate;

HON. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Speaker House of Representatives, United States.

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned executive council of the American Federation of Labor, and those accompanying us in the presentation of this document, submit to you the subject-matter of the grievances which the workmen of our country feel by reason of the indifferent position which the Congress of the United States has manifested toward the just, reasonable, and necessary measures which have been before it these past several years, and which particularly affect the interests of the working people, as well as by reason of the administrative acts of the executive branches of this Government and the legislation of the Congress relating to these interests. For convenience, the matters of which we complain are briefly stated, and are as follows:

The law commonly known as the "eight-hour law" has been found ineffective and insufficient to accomplish the purpose of its designers and framers. Labor has, since 1894, urged the passage of a law so as to remedy the defects, and for its extension to all work done for or on behalf of the Government. Our efforts have been in vain.

Without hearing of any kind granted to those who are the advocates of the eight-hour law and principle, Congress passed, and the President signed, an appropriation bill containing a rider nullifying the eight-hour law and principle in its application to the greatest public work ever undertaken by our Government, the construction of the Panama Canal.

The eight-hour law in terms provides that those intrusted with the supervision of Government work shall neither require nor permit any violations thereof. The law has been grievously and frequently violated. The violations have been reported to the heads of several Departments, who have refused to take the necessary steps for its enforcement.

While recognizing the necessity for the employment of inmates of our penal institutions, so that they may be self-supporting, labor has urged in vain the enactment of a law that shall safeguard it from the competition of the labor of convicts.

In the interest of all of our people, and in consonance with their almost general demand, we have urged Congress for some tangible relief from the constantly growing evil of induced and undesirable immigration, but without result.

Recognizing the danger of Chinese immigration, and responsive to the demands of the people, Congress years ago enacted an effective Chinese-exclusion law; yet, despite the experience of the people of our own country, as well as those of other countries, the present law is flagrantly violated, and now by act of Congress it is seriously proposed to invalidate that law and reverse the policy.

The partial relief secured by the laws of 1895 and 1898, providing that seamen shall not be compelled to endure involuntary servitude, has been seriously threatened at each succeeding Congress. The petitions to secure for the seamen equal right with all others have been denied, and a disposition shown to extend to other workmen the system of compulsory labor.

Under the guise of a bill to subsidize the shipping industry, a provision is incorporated, and has already passed the Senate, providing for a term of conscription, which would make compulsory naval service a condition precedent to employment on privately owned vessels.

Having in mind the terrible and unnecessary loss of life attending the burning of the *Stocum* in the harbor of New York, the wreck of the *Rio de Janeiro* at the entrance to the bay of San Francisco, and other disasters on the waters too numerous to mention, in nearly every case the great loss of life was due to the undermanning and the unskilled manning of such vessels, we presented to Congress measures that would, if enacted, so far as human law could do, make impossible the awful loss of life. We have sought this remedy more in the interests of the traveling public than in that of the seamen, but in vain.

Having in mind the constantly increasing evil growing out of the parsimony of corporations, of towing several undermanned and unequipped vessels called "barges" on the high seas, where, in case of storm or stress, they are cut loose to drift or sink and their crews to perish, we have urged the passage of a law that shall forbid the towing of more than one such vessel unless they shall have an equipment and a crew sufficient to manage them when cut loose and sent adrift, but in vain.

The antitrust and interstate-commerce laws enacted to protect the people against monopoly in the products of labor and against discrimination in the transportation thereof, have been perverted, so far as the laborers are concerned, so as to invade and violate their personal liberty as guaranteed by the Constitution. Our repeated efforts to obtain redress from Congress have been in vain.

The beneficent writ of injunction, intended to protect property rights has, as used in labor disputes, been perverted so as to attack and destroy personal freedom and in a manner to hold that the employer has some property rights in the labor of the workman. Instead of obtaining the relief which labor has sought, it is seriously threatened with statutory authority for existing judicial usurpation.

The Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives was instituted at the demand of labor to voice its sentiments, to advocate its rights, and to protect its interests. In the past two Congresses this committee has been so organized as to make ineffectual any attempt labor has made for redress. This being the fact in the last Congress, labor requested the Speaker to appoint on the Committee on Labor members who, from their experience, knowledge, and sympathy, would render in this Congress such service as the committee was originally designed to perform. Not only was labor's request ignored, but the hostile make-up of the committee was accentuated.

Recently the President issued an order forbidding any and all Government employees, upon the pain of instant dismissal from the Government service, to petition Congress for any redress of grievances or for any improvement in their condition. Thus the constitutional right of citizens to petition must be surrendered by the Government employee in order that he may obtain or retain his employment.

We present these grievances to your attention because we have long, patiently, and in vain waited for redress. There is not any matter of which we have complained but for which we have in an honorable and lawful manner submitted remedies. The remedies for these grievances proposed by labor are in line with fundamental law, and with the progress and development made necessary by changed industrial conditions.

Labor brings these, its grievances, to your attention because you are the representatives responsible for legislation and for failure of legislation. The toilers come to you as your fellow-citizens who, by reason of their position in life, have not only with all other citizens an equal interest in our country, but the further interest of being the burden-bearers, the wage-earners of America. As labor's representatives we ask you to redress these grievances, for it is in your power so to do.

Labor now appeals to you, and we trust that it may not be in vain. But if perchance you may not heed us, we shall appeal to the conscience and the support of our fellow-citizens.

Very respectfully,

Samuel Gompers, James Duncan, James O'Connell, Max Morris, D. A. Hayes, Daniel J. Keefe, Wm. D. Huber, Joseph F. Valentine, John B. Lennon, Frank Morrison, executive council, American Federation of Labor.

List of representatives of labor associated with the executive council of the American Federation of Labor in the presentation of labor's grievances, March 21, 1906.

John G. Schmidt, Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union of America.

Rudolph Schirra, Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union of America.

Thomas H. Lockwood, Pocket Knife Blade Grinders and Finishers' National Union.

Thos. R. Keenan, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders of America.

Peter L. Mitchell, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders of America.

James F. Speiss, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders of America.

John R. P. Krey, Iron Molders' Union of North America.

Ed. F. Weber, International Association Glass House Employees.

Hugh Falvey, American Brotherhood of Cement Workers.

F. C. Gengenback, American Brotherhood of Cement Workers.

P. H. Malloy, American Brotherhood of Cement Workers.

J. J. Crowley, The Granite Cutters' International Association of America.

John Lyons, The Granite Cutters' International Association of America.

Frank McArdle, International Brotherhood of Foundry Employees.

Cornelius P. Shea, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Thos. C. Fox, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

J. E. Toone, International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

James F. Fitzgerald, Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers.

Timothy Healey, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen.

N. A. James, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen.

H. E. Burns, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen.

F. M. Nuse, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen.

Christian Schlag, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen.

Wm. McPherson, International Carriage and Wagon Workers.

Wm. M. Merrick, Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, and Steam Fitters' Helpers of the United States and Canada.

Joseph H. Gallagher, Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, and Steam Fitters' Helpers of the United States and Canada.

John R. Alpine, Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, and Steam Fitters' Helpers of the United States and Canada.

P. H. Cummins, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths.

J. W. Kline, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths.

Chas. T. Smith, International Steel and Copper Plate Printers' Union of North America.

E. L. Jordan, International Steel and Copper Plate Printers' Union of North America.

T. L. Mahan, International Steel and Copper Plate Printers' Union of North America.

Wm. Dodge, Paving Cutters' Union of the United States and Canada.

Jas. J. Dunn, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada.
 Wm. Launer, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada.
 Frank Feeney, International Union of Elevator Constructors.
 Chas. Hank, International Brick, Tile, and Terra Cotta Workers' Alliance.
 Henry Nolda, Upholsterers' International Union of North America.
 Chas. E. Lawyer, International Tin Plate Workers' Protective Association of America.
 George Powell, International Tin Plate Workers' Protective Association of America.
 W. J. McSorley, International Union of Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers.
 R. V. Brandt, International Union of Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers.
 W. S. Crown, American Federation of Musicians.
 C. P. Huestis, American Federation of Musicians.
 Charles Derlin, American Federation of Musicians.
 Thomas F. Ryan, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance.
 Daniel L. Desmond, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance.
 Joseph A. Daly, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance.
 W. F. Gilmore, Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners.
 George G. Griffin, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners.
 William M. Lewis, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper-hangers of America.
 Frank X. Noschang, Journeymen Barbers' International Union.
 Thomas O. Hughes, International Union of Slate Workers.
 G. M. Huddleston, International Slate and Tile Workers' Union of America.
 Ben Russell, International Slate and Tile Workers' Union of America.
 Thomas F. Tracy, Cigar Makers' International Union of America.
 J. A. Roberts, Cigar Makers' International Union of America.
 Martin Hellmuth, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America.
 W. E. Thompson, International Ceramic, Mosaic, and Encaustic Tile Layers and Helpers' Union.
 C. O. Pratt, Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America.
 T. C. Parsons, International Typographical Union.
 John P. Murphy, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union.
 John J. Binder, International Union of United Brewery Workmen.
 John Mangan, Steam Fitters' International Union.
 James M. Cumming, Steam Fitters' International Union.
 Charles N. Isler, Steam Fitters' International Union.
 Henry Fischer, Tobacco Workers' International Union.
 William Feenle, United Powder and High Explosive Workers of America.
 James G. McGrindle, United Powder and High Explosive Workers of America.
 Andrew Furuseth, International Seamen's Union of America.
 J. L. Feeney, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders.
 Rodney L. Thixton, International Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Union of North America.
 Michael J. Shea, International Stereotypers and Electrotypers Union of North America.
 James F. Splann, International Stereotypers and Electrotypers Union of North America.
 F. M. Ryan, International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers.
 P. J. McArdle, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers.
 Martin Higgins, International Printing Pressmen's Union.
 John Golden, United Textile Workers of America.
 J. T. Carey, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, etc.
 Thomas Mellor, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, etc.
 H. B. Perham, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers.
 Jere F. McCarthy, Central Labor Union, Washington, D. C.
 Charles W. Winslow, Central Labor Union, Washington, D. C.
 John B. Colpoys, Central Labor Union, Washington, D. C.
 Shelby Smith, Allied Printing Trades Council, Philadelphia, Pa.
 John Fitzpatrick, Chicago Federation of Labor.
 P. J. Flannery, Interior Freight Handlers and Warehousemen's International Union.

Now, sir, while needed and important labor bills have been long postponed, the Republican party, in power, has not been slow in fortifying the beneficiaries of the present iniquitous fiscal system by amendments and in the other directions—for instance, through the form of a revision of the military laws by the Dick military bill in 1903. The law was by that act so far changed as to establish militarism more firmly and in a more aggravated form than in Germany, Russia, or any of the military despotisms of Europe.

Two sections of that drastic measure provide as follows:

Sec. 2150. All able-bodied male citizens of the United States, and persons of foreign birth who shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States under and in pursuance of the laws thereof, between the ages of 18 and 45 years, are hereby declared to constitute the national forces, and, with such exceptions and under such conditions as may be prescribed by law, shall be liable to perform military duty in the service of the United States.

Sec. 2277. The militia shall consist of every able-bodied male citizen of the respective States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and every able-bodied male of foreign birth who has declared his intention to become a citizen, who is more than 18 and less than 45 years of age, and shall be divided into two classes—the organized militia, to be known as the National Guard of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia, or by such other designations as may be given them by the laws of the respective States or Territories, and the remainder to be known as the Reserve Militia.

There was no delay in obtaining action on that bill. It went in and out of committee rooms with flying colors, as the trusts, railroad companies, and other monopolistic employers of labor pressed the button. And after it had passed both Houses it was signed by the President with equal promptness.

Now, under the provisions of that law, every able-bodied citizen—the members of a labor union, for instance—is made part and parcel of the reserve military force, both of the Federal Government and of the respective States. So, now, if a strike occurs, an unfair, slave-driving employer may invoke military aid, and every laborer may be made to bear arms for the purpose of putting down a strike declared by his own organization; or a regiment of strike breakers may be mustered into service to accomplish the same end. Surely no working-man in this Republic, whether belonging to any organization or not, should rest contented for a day until a repeal or a material modification of that act has been secured.

Sir, in the confusion arising from several matters affecting labor interests, facilities are offered for deception being practiced upon voters by Republican candidates. The vital and decisive thing, not to be lost sight of for a moment, is the effect upon the election of the Speaker of the next Congress of voting for candidates of the respective parties.

Of what avail, as affecting labor interests, to rely upon or value to any extent the promises of Republican candidates to support labor measures when they know in making them that if the Republicans have a majority of the membership in the next Congress, the opportunity to vote either for or against such a bill will never be afforded. The only way to bind such candidates effectively for labor bills is to exact pledges from them not to enter the party caucus for Speaker, and to vote for the adoption of a set of rules entirely different from those now in vogue. Of course not one of them will, in good faith, give any such pledge. There is nothing surer, barring death, than that, if a Republican be reelected Speaker, he will shape and

control all the proceedings, from action on bills in the House down to the most trivial and obscure transactions behind the closed doors of committee rooms.

The House is not now representative, except in the sense that in the person of the Speaker it represents a despotism. Before any relief can be had by labor, or by any other honest interests, there must be a change in personnel of the Speaker and in the rules of procedure. These are impossible without a change in the party complexion of the House. This is obvious, and nothing is gained by attempting to conceal the facts. No attempt is now made to cloak the autocratic character of the Speaker's power under the rules which he and his little coterie have formulated and forced on the people by unsparing use of the party lash. The Speaker has publicly declared his personal responsibility for all legislation, and on June 28, 1906, Hon. W. W. RUCKER, a Member from Missouri, on the floor of the House made the following statement, which was not denied:

The committees of this House are carefully formed, so as to advance or prevent legislation, as the party in power wishes. For months friends of the workingman sought to induce the Committee on Labor to report the eight-hour bill, but their efforts were futile until, on May 29, when it happened that only seven members of the committee—four Democrats and three Republicans—were present, and the Democrats, being in the majority, ordered the bill favorably reported. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GARDNER] was authorized to make a report. His report on the bill was filed in the House on June 26. I appealed to the Speaker to-day to recognize me for the purpose of asking unanimous consent for the consideration of this bill, and he promptly refused my request in a manner quite emphatic. I soon realized that even though I could speak with the tongue of angels, and had all faith so that I might remove mountains, yet I could not possibly move a Republican Speaker of this House to consent to legislation in the interest of 3,000,000 American workingmen. Thus this just measure, ordered reported by Democratic votes, will die on the Calendar because we have not a Democratic Speaker in the chair.

In view of these facts and these considerations, any yielding in the coming campaign to promises and pledges made by Republican candidates for Congress, to the extent of voting for them, would be so flagrantly foolish as not to admit of any standard of comparison.

